

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

-----x
In re : Chapter 9
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN, : Case No. 13-53846
Debtor. : Hon. Steven W. Rhodes
-----x

**OMNIBUS RESPONSE TO SYNCORA AND FGIC'S
MOTIONS *IN LIMINE* TO PRECLUDE INTRODUCTION
OF EVIDENCE PROTECTED BY THE MEDIATION ORDER**

The City of Detroit (the "City"), debtor in the above captioned case, hereby responds to (i) Syncora Capital Assurance Inc. and Syncora Guarantee Inc.'s ("Syncora") Motion *in Limine* Barring the City from Introducing Communications Protected by the Court's Mediation Order [Docket No. 6979] (the "Syncora MIL") and (ii) Financial Guaranty Insurance Company's ("FGIC") Motion *in Limine* to Preclude the Introduction of Evidence or Testimony Regarding Matters Withheld from Discovery on the Basis of the Mediation Order [Docket No. 6985] (the "FGIC MIL" and together with the Syncora MIL, the "Mediation MILs").

1. This Court entered the "Mediation Order" [Docket No. 322] on August 13, 2013, which commands, as relevant here, that "[a]ll proceedings, discussions, negotiation, and writings incident to mediation shall be privileged and

confidential, and shall not be disclosed, filed or placed in evidence.” Mediation Order at ¶4.

2. The Syncora MIL seeks to preclude the City from offering evidence of any communications that are covered by the Court’s Mediation Order, including “state of mind” evidence that is based in whole or in part on any such communications. *See* Syncora MIL at ¶3. The FGIC MIL similarly seeks to bar the introduction of evidence or testimony that was previously withheld on the basis of the Mediation Order, as well as any evidence of settlement negotiations. *See* FGIC MIL at ¶¶18, 19.

3. The Mediation MILs should be denied. As both FGIC and Syncora surely know, the City is already required to comply with the Mediation Order. Indeed, this Court has already made clear that parties will be held accountable for even inadvertent violations of the terms of the Mediation Order. Any order requiring the City to comply with the Mediation Order would be duplicative and unnecessary, and any suggestion that the City intends to violate the Mediation Order in open court is simply baseless. Moreover, as both Syncora and FGIC state, the Mediation Order is not a sword and cannot be used as such. Rather, the Mediation Order protects certain communications and information and must be construed according to its terms – particularly with respect to its confidentiality provisions. To the extent the Mediation MILs seek to broaden the

reach of the Mediation Order beyond its plain and clear terms, they must be denied.

BACKGROUND

4. This Court entered the Mediation Order on August 13, 2013. Since that time, *all parties*, including the City, have been bound by its terms, including its provision that “[a]ll proceedings, discussions, negotiation, and writings incident to mediation shall be privileged and confidential, and shall not be disclosed, filed or placed in evidence.” Mediation Order at ¶4.

5. The City’s Sixth Amended Plan for the Adjustment of Debts of the City of Detroit (August 20, 2014) [Docket No. 6908] (the “Plan”) was filed on August 20, 2014. The hearing with respect to confirmation of the Plan (the “Confirmation Hearing”) is scheduled to commence on September 2, 2014.

ARGUMENT

I. THE CITY IS ALREADY REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE MEDIATION ORDER AND THUS RELIEF REQUESTED IN THESE MOTIONS IS DUPLICATIVE

6. Motions *in limine* should not seek duplicative relief. *See Clark v. Tenn. Valley Elec. Coop.*, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28994, at *8 (W.D. Tenn. Apr. 2, 2002) (denying motion *in limine* as duplicative where it addressed documents already the subject of a court order); *Abrams v. Ciba Specialty Chems. Corp.*, No. 08-0068-WS-B, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145755, at *14-17 (S.D. Al. Mar. 22, 2010) (denying one motion *in limine* where parties concur evidence is not properly

admissible at trial and another motion *in limine* where issue is “redundant of arguments previously presented to, and resolved by this Court via Order”); *cf. Watts v. UPS*, No. 03-00589, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 126746, at *3 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 5, 2013) (motion *in limine* moot where opposing party agreed it had no intention of introducing evidence at issue). Simply put, there is no need to exclude evidence that is already excluded.

7. The Mediation Order is clear. Neither the City, nor any participant in the mediations nor indeed any third party, may reveal the proceedings, discussions, negotiations and writings incident to that mediation. Moreover, the Mediation Order is not a privilege that a party may “invoke” or “waive” – it is an order of this Court. The City is well aware of this, hence, much to FGIC and Syncora’s apparent frustration, it has endeavored over the course of discovery in connection with its Plan to fully comply with the Mediation Order’s terms.¹

¹ It appears this frustration was caused at least in part by the “wide range” of issues relating to which the City has invoked the Mediation Order. Syncora MIL at ¶1 (“the City and other Plan supporters have invoked the Mediation Order when questioned about (a) the terms, structure, and negotiations surrounding the DIA Settlement; (b) the calculation of the OPEB Claim amount; (c) the status of the negotiations surrounding the City’s new collective bargaining agreements; (d) the status of negotiations with public safety groups; (e) the bases for differing treatment of COPs and LTGO, UTGO, retiree, and other creditors; and (f) the potential for asset monetization via the DWSD transaction”). In response, the City simply

8. Ironically, as a result of this compliance, Syncora and FGIC now apparently seek to bar the City from introducing information related to the mediation at the Confirmation Hearing—*i.e.*, to require compliance with the Mediation Order. This is duplicative and not an appropriate use of a motion *in limine*.

9. Regardless of the outcome of the Mediation MILs, the City will continue to comply with the Mediation Order when it presents its case at the Confirmation Hearing. The Mediation MILs, however, misrepresent the nature of this continued compliance.

A. The City Will Comply With the Mediation Order *Independent Of The Fact That It Was Properly Complied With During Discovery.*

10. Syncora seeks to cast compliance with the Mediation Order as a punishment or, at a minimum, a consequence of having previously abided by its terms. *See* Syncora MIL at ¶3 (“In light of the City’s extensive invocation of the

notes that each of those matters was referred by this Court to mediation. *See, e.g.*, First Order Referring Matters to Facilitative Mediation [Docket No. 0333] (referring treatment of claims of various creditor classes and negotiation of collective bargaining agreements to mediation); Order to Certain Parties to Appear for Continued Mediation on LTGO Matters [Docket No. 2344]; Order to Certain Parties to Appear for Continued Mediation on UTGO Matters [Docket No. 2345]; Order to Certain Parties to Appear for Continued Mediation on DWSD Matters [Docket No. 2346]; Order of Referral to Mediation [Docket No. 4156] (referring regional water authority to mediation); Order to Appear for Continued Mediation on “COPs” Matters [Docket No. 5612].

Mediation Order, the City should not be permitted to introduce evidence of any communications incident to mediation.”). Syncora requests that the City pay a price for its compliance with the Mediation Order by being *required to abide by its terms at the Confirmation Hearing*. This is both nonsensical and unnecessary, because the City has every intention of continuing to comply with the Mediation Order in all respects.

11. The City (and all parties) are not precluded from offering information that is incident to mediation because they have appropriately complied with the Mediation Order in the past. Rather, they are so precluded because the Mediation Order is an order of this Court, and all parties are bound to follow it as such. Accordingly, there is no basis to grant the Syncora MIL as it both misrepresents and re-imposes already existing obligations.

B. The City Has Properly Relied on the Mediation Order Throughout Discovery and Will Not Use Previously Properly Withheld Information at the Confirmation Hearing.

12. Both FGIC and Syncora assert variations of the “sword and shield” argument in support of the Mediation MILs. Yet these assertions rely on cases addressing recognized privileges and the Mediation Order is not such a privilege. Specifically, the FGIC MIL seeks to prevent the disclosure of all information previously withheld pursuant to the Mediation Order on the ground that it is “axiomatic that a party cannot use a claim of privilege or confidentiality as

a shield and a sword.” FGIC MIL at ¶15. Syncora in turn asserts that “the City has used the Mediation Order to shield information relating to the states of mind of the City’s agents and employees to the extent such information is based on the mediation” and that they would now be subject to “unfair surprise and prejudice” if such evidence is presented at the Confirmation Hearing. Syncora MIL at ¶¶12, 14. Syncora and FGIC claim that, having used the Mediation Order as a shield, the City must now be precluded from using it as a sword.

13. They have both missed the mark for the simple reason that the City only “shielded” information properly subject to the Mediation Order, and the City *already cannot use such mediation-related information at the Confirmation Hearing*. The City is obliged to continue abiding by the terms of the Mediation Order—nothing more, and nothing less.

14. The rule against using privileged information as a “sword and shield” means that a party cannot “hide behind the privilege if [it is] relying upon privileged communications to make [its] case,” *In re Lott*, 424 F.3d 446, 454 (6th Cir. 2005) (*citing United States v. Bilzerian*, 926 F.2d 1285, 1292 (2d Cir. 1991)), for example, by “disclos[ing] some selected communications for self-serving purposes,” *Bilzerian*, 926 F.2d at 1292. The sword and shield reference is inapplicable here, for two reasons. First, the Mediation Order is not a privilege the City may selectively invoke even if it so wished. FGIC, in fact, appears to

recognize it: “the Court has acknowledged that the Mediation Order is a court order which cannot be waived.” FGIC MIL at ¶11. Second, and more importantly, the City has never had any intention of relying on “mediation-privileged” communications to make its case and is not selectively waiving the terms of the Mediation Order to make its case. Specifically, the City will not introduce testimony at the Confirmation Hearing about the proceedings, discussions, negotiations and writings incident to mediation. To be crystal clear, information that was “previously withheld” on the basis of the Mediation Order will not be introduced at the Confirmation Hearing.

15. Likewise, the litany of cases cited in the Mediation MILs relate to assertions of the attorney-client privilege and are inapplicable here. Both *Huzjak v. United States*, 118 F.R.D. 61, 64-65 (N.D. Ohio 1987) (FGIC MIL at ¶15), and *Mariner v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.*, 202 F. Supp. 430, 434 (N.D. Ohio 1962) (FGIC MIL at ¶15), concern an alleged waiver of the physician/patient privilege. In *Int'l Tel. & Tel. Corp. v. United Tel. Co. of Fla.*, 60 F.R.D. 177, 186 (M.D. Fla. 1973) (FGIC MIL at ¶14), *Baxter Travenol Labs., Inc. v. Abbott Labs*, No. 84 C 5103, 1987 WL 10988, at *1 (N.D. Ill. May 12, 1987) (FGIC MIL at ¶14), *In re Lott*, 424 F.3d 446, 454 (6th Cir. 2005) (FGIC MIL at ¶15) and *Ross v. City of Memphis*, 423 F.3d 596, 603 (6th Cir. 2005) (FGIC MIL at ¶15), the Court addressed the fairness of an assertion of attorney-client privilege. Finally, in

Chevron Corp. v. Stratus Consulting, Inc., No. 10-CV-00047, 2010 WL 3923092, at *10 (D. Colo. Oct. 1, 2010) (FGIC MIL at ¶15), the Court addressed the waiver of both the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine under the “sword-shield doctrine.” Thus none of the foregoing cases cited and relied upon by FGIC are relevant here.

16. *Arista Records LLC v. Lime Grp. LLC*, 06 CV 5936 KMW, 2011 WL 1642434 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 20, 2011)—which Syncora relies on at some length (Syncora MIL at ¶¶7, 13)—similarly provides no support for Syncora’s argument that preclusion of certain state of mind evidence based, in whole or in part, on events or information that are incident to mediation, is warranted here. In that case, Defendants “repeatedly invoked privilege to block Plaintiffs’ inquiry into any facts that may have served as the basis for Defendants’ alleged good faith belief in the lawfulness of their conduct,” only to then seek at trial to assert that belief. *Arista*, 2011 WL 1642434, at *5-6. The case stands for the unremarkable proposition that “a party may not assert that it believed its conduct was lawful, and then simultaneously claim *privilege* to block inquiry into the basis for the party’s state of mind or belief.” *Id.* at *7-8 (emphasis added); *see also United States v. Doe (In re Grand Jury Proceedings)*, 219 F.3d 175, 182 (2d Cir. 2000) (addressing alleged waiver of attorney-client and work product privileges) (Syncora MIL at ¶7).

17. The City is not doing—and has no intention of doing—that here. The City has, where necessary, prevented the disclosure of state of mind and other evidence that is confidential under the terms of the Mediation Order. As set forth above, the City has no intention of introducing evidence, state of mind or otherwise, that requires the disclosure of information incident to mediation at the Confirmation Hearing – nor could it, without violating the Mediation Order. Neither Syncora nor FGIC asserts in the Mediation MILs that the City’s instructions at the depositions were improper or somehow incorrect interpretations of the Mediation Order. Any previously withheld information was therefore properly withheld and will properly continue to be withheld. Instead, the City can, and will, prove its case at the Confirmation Hearing using evidence that is *not* barred from disclosure by the Mediation Order and that it is not in any way precluded from introducing.

II. THE CITY INTENDS TO PROVE ITS FACTUAL PROPOSITIONS WITHOUT VIOLATING THE MEDIATION ORDER.

18. The City’s intention to abide by the Mediation Order should thus be clear, and the City concurs in the Mediation MILs to the extent they seek to reaffirm this obligation. Nonetheless, the City is compelled to respond to Syncora and FGIC’s unfounded assertions that the City intends to—or somehow needs to—violate the Mediation Order at the Confirmation Hearing. *See* Syncora MIL at ¶9 (“the City has indicated that it intends to introduce evidence relating to discussions

and negotiations that occurred as part of the Court-ordered mediation”); FGIC MIL at ¶8 (“it has become clear that the City plans to use information related to mediation in the Confirmation Hearing”). The City has no such intention or need.

19. The City has identified a number of factual propositions it intends to prove at the Confirmation Hearing.² It still intends to do so, and it will do so without disclosing any of the information rendered confidential pursuant to paragraph 4 of the Mediation Order. The City, an active participant in months of hotly-contested mediations, will prove that the negotiated solutions reached via mediation are in the best interests of the City and its creditors and fair, equitable and reasonable. To do so, it need not—and will not—rely on “mediation-privileged” communications that went back and forth amongst the participants, and it will not selectively apply the Mediation Order to meet its burden of proof with respect to confirmation of the Plan.

20. The colloquies cited in the Mediation MILs are evidence of this admittedly fine line that the City will continue to walk. FGIC and Syncora were not blocked from obtaining discoverable information. Far from it. Instead, over the course of both one and two-day depositions, when FGIC and Syncora asked questions regarding discussions or events that did not invade the Mediation Order,

² A copy of the Factual Propositions are attached to the Syncora MIL as Exhibit 6F and to the FGIC MIL as Exhibit 6G.

the City's witnesses answered them. Only when FGIC and Syncora decided to venture into areas they knew were governed by the Mediation Order did the City properly block their efforts.

21. The Grand Bargain provides an illustrative example. Indeed, Mr. Rapson was instructed not to answer with respect to conversations with Judge Rosen regarding the Grand Bargain.³ Other than conversations with Judge Rosen, and other mediation participants, however, Mr. Rapson answered numerous questions with respect to the Grand Bargain, including the fact that the Kresge Foundation's "contribution is predicated on it serving three purposes: One, to help expedite the resolution of the bankruptcy; two, to soften the blow to pensioners;

³ For example, the following is instructive:

MR. MCCARTHY: So to the extent I ask you about the back and forth with [Judge] Rosen or any other parties who were involved with the mediation that took place after your initial meeting with Judge Rosen regarding the Grand Bargain, which was at a dinner, as you referenced, will you be able to answer those questions here today?

MR. SHUMAKER: I would be interposing an objection to all such questions, because I believe that back and forth would be covered by the mediation order entered by Judge Rosen.

Rapson Dep. 86:14 – 86:23.

and three, to help preserve the DIA’s collection.” Rapson Dep. 43:9 – 43:12; *see also* Rapson Dep. 43:25 – 50:5, 79:25 – 81:6.⁴

22. Similarly, the Mediation Order was invoked just once at Mr. Gilbert’s deposition, with respect to a conversation between Mr. Beal of the DIA and Mr. Gilbert. Gilbert Dep. 130:2 – 130:7 (MR. ARNAULT: Okay. And what did he say about donating to the Grand Bargain when you had this meeting with him? MR. SHUMAKER: I’m going to object because I believe that any of these discussions would have been covered by the mediation order...”). Mr. Gilbert was asked, and did answer multiple questions about his motivation in donating to the Grand Bargain and his views with respect to the DIA. *See* Gilbert Dep. 126:12 – 149:3.⁵ He did not respond only to a question asking to reveal *specifically what was said* by a participant in the mediation. The witness’ compliance with the Mediation Order was thus narrowly tailored and wholly appropriate.

23. Mr. Orr’s deposition is equally instructive. Contrary to FGIC’s assertion that “*all* substantive conversations between the City and certain parties are confidential” (FGIC MIL at ¶16), the City did allow counsel for Syncora to explore *all* discussions and events that occurred outside of the mediation umbrella.

⁴ Relevant excerpts of the transcript of Mr. Rapson’s deposition are attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

⁵ Relevant excerpts of the transcript of Mr. Gilbert’s deposition are attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

See Orr Dep. 336:4 – 337:20.⁶ That only one such conversation occurred, to the best of Mr. Orr’s recollection, and that FGIC does not believe it was sufficiently “substantive,” does not take away from the appropriateness of the City’s application of the Mediation Order. *See* Orr Dep. 336:18 – 336:25 (“MR. HACKNEY: And just for the record, you didn’t have any such conversations prior to the entry of the mediation order... MR. ORR: Well, let me think. I think I had one meeting with Darren Walker at Ford Foundation, but it was not about a contribution, it was just a meet and greet.”).

24. Similarly, FGIC’s assertion that the City “cannot disclose to FGIC all of the reasons that Class 9 is discriminated against under the Plan” is easily dismissed. FGIC MIL at ¶16; *see also* FGIC MIL at ¶7. Mr. Orr clearly testified, to the best of his recollection, as to the numerous reasons for such discrimination. *See* Orr Dep. 203:9 – 211:9; 223:16 – 225:16; 235:23 – 237:22; 238:6 – 241:5. And finally, Counsel’s inquiry into Mr. Orr’s “state of mind,” was blocked only where it was blatantly a backdoor attempt to discover *specific communications made by parties involved in the mediation, incident to mediation.* *See* Orr Dep. 338:17 – 339:2; *compare* Orr Dep. 274:11 – 275:13. All rhetoric aside, what Mr. Orr did not do, nor could he have done without violating the

⁶ Relevant excerpts of the transcript of Mr. Orr’s deposition are attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

Mediation Order, was disclose the contents of “positions taken” in mediation, as well as “reports provided to [him] out of the mediation.” *See* Orr Dep. 350:4 – 350:8.

25. The City will walk the same line at the Confirmation Hearing. Without envisioning every possible scenario, it is clear that the City can present evidence of the reasonableness of its settlements without revealing a “he said, she said” transcript of what occurred in mediation. Indeed, this approach is fully consistent with that proposed by the Court when Syncora first raised this issue of the City’s supposed inability to prove its case without violating the mediation order. On May 28, 2014 the Court, referencing the City’s proposed factual proposition that funds would not otherwise have been available for the Grand Bargain if not dedicated to pensions, stated:

THE COURT: We’ll look at two, and would otherwise -- and would not otherwise be available to the city. The city could well prove that by calling someone from the foundations and the DIA to testify to that without breaching confidentiality of what was said in mediation.

May 28, 2014 Hrg. Tr. 184:15 – 184:18.

26. In order to meet its burden at the Confirmation Hearing, the City can, and will, distinguish between evidence and testimony that is incident to mediation and that is not. There is no need to preclude the City from doing what it is already barred from doing, and any suggestion that the City intends to violate the Mediation Order is baseless and contrary to the City’s conduct thus far.

III. EVIDENCE OF SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS NOT OTHERWISE PRECLUDED FROM DISCLOSURE BY THE MEDIATION ORDER IS ADMISSIBLE.

27. FGIC, in addition to reminding the City that it must continue to comply with the Mediation Order and not to disclose information previously withheld in compliance therewith, also seeks to bar the introduction of any evidence of “settlement negotiations” on the grounds that they are irrelevant. This is an overreach.

28. In order for all parties to present their cases at the Confirmation Hearing, the Mediation Order must be construed no broadly than its text allows. It precludes the introduction of evidence the Court has ruled irrelevant, specifically, any discussion of “who said what to whom during the mediation.” June 26, 2014 Hrg. Tr. at 49:12 – 49:14. It does not preclude, and the Court has not deemed irrelevant, “any evidence related to the settlement negotiations,” without regard to whether or not that evidence implicates matters incident to mediation.

29. The case law offered by FGIC in support of this broad request is inapposite. Unlike in *Provident Life & Acc. Ins. Co. v. Adie*, 176 F.R.D. 246, 250 (E.D. Mich. 1997), there is no “prior ruling by the court” that this evidence ought to be excluded. What the Court has ruled, and what the City intends to follow, is that no party may introduce evidence or testimony that is subject to paragraph 4 of the Mediation Order.

30. To the extent there is evidence of settlement negotiations that does not implicate the Mediation Order, there is simply no basis to preclude the City from introducing it at the Confirmation Hearing. In particular, evidence of the *fact* that such negotiations occurred, as well as the *nature* of those negotiations, can and should be admissible. The hard-fought, arms-length nature of the mediations, the sophisticated nature of the parties, their counsel and the mediators themselves and the terms of the ultimate agreements, while all may be characterized as “related to the settlement negotiations,” are in no way precluded by the Mediation Order or a prior ruling of this Court, and the City fully intends to rely on this evidence at the Confirmation Hearing.

WHEREFORE, the City respectfully requests that this Court deny the
Mediation MILs.

Dated: August 27, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Heather Lennox
Heather Lennox (OH 0059649)
David G. Heiman (OH 0038271)
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone: (216) 586-3939
Facsimile: (216) 579-0212
dgheiman@jonesday.com
hlennox@jonesday.com

Bruce Bennett (CA 105430)
JONES DAY
555 South Flower Street
Fiftieth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 243-2382
Facsimile: (213) 243-2539
bbennett@jonesday.com

Thomas F. Cullen, Jr. (DC 224733)
Gregory M. Shumaker (DC 416537)
JONES DAY
51 Louisiana Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 879-3939
Facsimile: (202) 626-1700
tfcullen@jonesday.com
gshumaker@jonesday.com

Robert S. Hertzberg (P30261)
Deborah Kovsky-Apap (P68258)
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP
4000 Town Center, Suite 1800
Southfield, MI 48075
Telephone: (248) 359-7300
Facsimile: (248) 359-7700
hertzbergr@pepperlaw.com
kovskyd@pepperlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF DETROIT

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

In re)
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN) Chapter 9
) Case No.: 13-53846
Debtor.) Hon. Steven W. Rhodes
)
)
)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 27, 2014, I electronically filed the City's Omnibus Response To Syncora And FGIC's Motions *In Limine* To Preclude Introduction Of Evidence Protected By The Mediation Order, which sends notice by operation of the Court's electronic filing service to all ECF participants registered to receive notice in this case.

Dated: *August 27, 2014*

/s/ Heather Lennox

Heather Lennox

Exhibit 1

RIP RAPSON
IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

In re) Chapter 9
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,) Case No. 13-53846
Debtor.) Hon. Steven W. Rhodes

The Videotaped Deposition of RIP RAPSON,
Taken at 1114 Washington Boulevard,
Detroit, Michigan,
Commencing at 9:02 a.m.,
Thursday, July 31, 2014,
Before Rebecca L. Russo, CSR-2759, RMR, CRR.

1 RIP RAPSON
2 EDWARD R. McCARTHY, ESQ.
3 PRAVIN R. PATEL, ESQ.
4 Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP
5 1395 Brickell Avenue
6 Suite 1200
7 Miami, Florida 33131
8 Appearng on behalf of the Financial Guaranty
9 Insurance Company.
10
11
12
13
14 KELLEY M. HALADYNA, ESQ.
15 Dickinson Wright PLLC
16 500 Woodward Avenue
17 Suite 4000
18 Detroit, Michigan 48226
19 Appearng on behalf of the State of Michigan.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 RIP RAPSON
2 APPEARANCES:
3
4 GREGORY M. SHUMAKER, ESQ.
5 Jones Day
6 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
7 Washington, D.C. 20001
8 Appearng on behalf of the City of Detroit.
9
10
11
12 ROBERT S. HERTZBERG, ESQ.
13 Pepper Hamilton LLP
14 Suite 1800
15 4000 Town Center
16 Southfield, Michigan 48075
17 Appearng on behalf of the City of Detroit.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 RIP RAPSON
2 DANIEL MORRIS, ESQ. (Via Telephone)
3 Dentons US LLP
4 1301 K Street, N.W.
5 Washington, D.C. 20005
6 Appearng on behalf of the Retiree Committee.
7
8
9
10 DIANA A. SANDERS, ESQ. (Via Telephone)
11 Chadbourne & Parke, LLP
12 30 Rockefeller Place
13 New York, New York 10112
14 Appearng on behalf of Assured Guaranty Municipal
15 Corp.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 RIP RAPSON
 2 frame?
 3 A. I'm sorry, I just don't, I don't recall exactly when
 4 it was.
 5 Q. I'm asking those time frames, because, based on my
 6 knowledge, they relate to the millage bid.
 7 A. Okay.
 8 Q. But to refresh your recollection, does that at all
 9 spur your memory as to when it would have been?
 10 A. Well, it would have been, it would have been prior to
 11 the millage, so, again, I apologize, I don't recall
 12 what the exact sequence might have been.
 13 Q. Prior to Kresge's involvement in the Grand Bargain or
 14 the mediation, et al, did Kresge have any formal plans
 15 to donate to the DIA moving forward?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. And what were those plans?
 18 A. Kresge has developed a program shortly after I came in
 19 which we provide operating support to a wide spectrum
 20 of arts and cultural organizations in the southeast
 21 Michigan area. It's, I think, risen to almost 60
 22 organizations.
 23 We calibrate those contributions based on
 24 budget size, largely. It's a little bit formula
 25 related, and the DIA is one of those.

1 RIP RAPSON
 2 I think our, our support for them is, if I
 3 recall correctly, approximately a hundred thousand
 4 dollars a year in operating support.
 5 Q. And that's a continuing amount, the hundred thousand
 6 dollars a year?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Is that continuing as we sit here today?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. And when did that, I guess agreement of Kresge to
 11 provide a hundred thousand dollars, roughly, in
 12 operating support to the DIA begin?
 13 A. Boy, I want to say maybe 2007, 2008, approximately. I
 14 think that's when we developed the program.
 15 Q. How much money has Kresge agreed to contribute to the
 16 Grand Bargain?
 17 A. A hundred million dollars.
 18 Q. Is that hundred million dollars more money than Kresge
 19 has contributed to any one cause since your time at
 20 Kresge?
 21 A. To any one cause -- you mean any one institution or
 22 cause?
 23 Q. Let's start with institution.
 24 A. Yes. I would -- could I just qualify that this
 25 hundred million dollars was not a contribution to the

1 RIP RAPSON
 2 Detroit Institute of Art.
 3 Q. How would you describe the hundred million dollars?
 4 A. It was a contribution to the effectuation of the Grand
 5 Bargain.
 6 Q. And do you believe that the hundred million dollars
 7 that Kresge has agreed to contribute is in any way
 8 tied to the DIA?
 9 A. Our contribution is predicated on it serving three
 10 purposes: One, to help expedite the resolution of the
 11 bankruptcy; two, to soften the blow to pensioners; and
 12 three, to help preserve the DIA's collection. So I
 13 guess the answer would be yes.
 14 Q. A portion of the hundred million dollars would go, in
 15 your opinion, to the third prong of why Kresge is
 16 contributing money to the Grand Bargain?
 17 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.
 18 MR. MORRIS: Object to the form.
 19 A. I was going to object to the form, as well --
 20 BY MR. MCCARTHY:
 21 Q. You're entitled to.
 22 A. -- in the sense that we didn't allocate money to those
 23 three prongs. We allocated money to the totality of
 24 the package.
 25 Q. You mentioned the first prong was to help expedite the

1 RIP RAPSON
 2 resolution of the bankruptcy, correct?
 3 A. That's correct.
 4 Q. And how do you believe the Grand Bargain would help
 5 expedite the resolution of the bankruptcy?
 6 A. It provides additional resources that help resolve two
 7 of the major sticking points to the resolution, both
 8 by helping alleviate the pressure on pensioners and by
 9 safeguarding the Detroit Institute's assets.
 10 I think in both of those senses if you can
 11 get rid of -- not get rid of, if you can help
 12 ameliorate both of those issues, then you've
 13 presumably enabled the -- given, given tools to help
 14 the bankruptcy move forward.
 15 Q. And I believe you've -- I've seen in some of my
 16 diligence for today you talk about the three prongs
 17 here you just mentioned, which is expediting the
 18 resolution of the bankruptcy, softening the blow to
 19 the pensioners, and preserving the collection at the
 20 DIA. Is that true?
 21 A. Have I said that or written about that? Yes.
 22 Q. And did you develop these three prongs as you've
 23 stated them?
 24 A. They -- I'm not sure that it's a thought original to
 25 me, but that is the way that we've conceptualized and

RIP RAPSON

2 A. I've had one meeting with Bob and Greg, when they
3 first raised the possibility of my testifying, and
4 they suggested areas that they felt my testimony might
5 touch on.

6 Q. And that was with Mr. Hertzberg and Mr. Shumaker?

7 A. Pardon me, yes.

8 Q. And when was -- that meeting was about a month ago.
9 Where was that meeting?

10 A. I think it was a couple of months ago. Time flies.
11 It was in our offices at the Kresge Foundation.

12 Q. And is that in -- your offices are in Detroit?

13 A. They're in Troy.

14 Q. Was anybody else present at that meeting with
15 Mr. Shumaker and Mr. Hertzberg?

16 A. No, I think, I don't -- I think it was just the three
17 of us.

18 Q. Outside of that meeting with Mr. Shumaker and
19 Mr. Hertzberg, have you had any other meetings about
20 the potential areas that you may testify about at the
21 upcoming trial for the City of Detroit bankruptcy?

22 A. Only the, the meeting we had yesterday to, to think
23 about today's session.

24 Q. And during that meeting yesterday, Mr. Shumaker and
25 Mr. Hertzberg were also present?

RIP RAPSON

2 A. They were.
3 Q. And what did you talk about in yesterday's meeting
4 about -- in the presence of Mr. Shumaker and
5 Mr. Hertzberg about your potential testimony at the
6 City of Detroit bankruptcy trial?
7 A. Yesterday was more a conversation about the topics
8 that might be raised in today's deposition.
9 Q. And to give you a sense of why I'm doing this, so you
10 don't think I'm trying to trick you in this area, what
11 I'd really like to get at is, with this line of
12 questions is to try to figure out what you might
13 testify about and what you might not testify about --
14 A. Sure.
15 Q. -- so that we don't waste time on areas you're not
16 going to talk about.
17 A. Sure.
18 Q. At yesterday's meeting or at the prior meeting with
19 Mr. Shumaker, Mr. Hertzberg -- and Mr. Hertzberg, did
20 you talk about what areas you might address in your
21 testimony at an eventual trial on plan feasibility?
22 A. Again, again, I'm sorry, I'm not trying to be
23 difficult, it really was not geared so much to the
24 testimony I might offer at trial as to what, what
25 might you inquire about and did I feel that I needed

RIP RAPSON

and one of the consequences of that meeting was to, to be in touch with independent counsel to make sure that what the City wanted was actually something that I could provide.

Q. And I don't -- to be very clear, I don't -- I'm trying to avoid and don't want to get into any conversations that you had independently just with your counsel or Kresge's counsel, because those are privileged and I do respect that.

So as you sit here today, is there a way for you to parcel out --

A. Sure, fair enough. Yeah, I'm sorry, I do understand.

Q. So with that qualification --

A. Yup.

Q. -- can you tell me what areas --

A. Yup.

Q. -- VO

Q. You discussed certain law problems with your own personal lawyer, or in the presence of other people other than your personal lawyer with respect to what areas you would testify about at the upcoming trial?

A. We talked a little bit about my degree of familiarity with the plan of adjustment, some of its component pieces in terms of the investments that are being proposed for things like blight removal, transit

Page 61	Page 63
<p style="text-align: center;">RIP RAPSON</p> <p>1 reform, public safety, and a host of other things that 2 are included.</p> <p>3 They wondered if I had a view about whether 4 those were areas that were useful to be included in a 5 plan of adjustment and how they might or might not fit 6 with the work that Kresge was doing.</p> <p>7 We talked a little bit about Kresge's 8 history of commitment to the city and whether that 9 commitment was likely to endure and be extended into 10 the future post-bankruptcy. They asked if I was able 11 to have a view of the kind of work that we might do 12 going forward to help revitalize the city.</p> <p>13 I think in many ways that was much of the 14 conversation. It was really very Kresge-specific, you 15 know, what is it that we have done, what is it that we 16 intend to do, what is it that we might imagine doing 17 in a post-bankruptcy world.</p> <p>18 Q. With respect to the first topic, the degree of 19 familiarity with the plan of adjustment, how familiar 20 are you with the plan of adjustment or various 21 versions of the plan of adjustment that the City has 22 submitted to the bankruptcy court?</p> <p>23 A. I have, I have not read the plan of adjustment in its 24 entirety. I have, I have looked at excerpts that</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RIP RAPSON</p> <p>1 is -- over time gives me a fairly strong understanding 2 of how cities work and what some of the interventions 3 are to make them healthier.</p> <p>4 But I wouldn't want to characterize that as 5 being an expert.</p> <p>6 BY MR. McCARTHY:</p> <p>7 Q. Having not read -- I don't want to put words in your 8 mouth, but having not read in totality any of the 9 various forms of the plan of adjustment, I take 10 it -- well, tell me, have you read in totality or any 11 portion of the reinvestment initiatives that the City 12 has put forth with respect to its plan of adjustment?</p> <p>13 A. I have looked at that, what I think is that section of 14 the document that -- I read it only once. Most of my 15 knowledge of it, frankly, has come from public media 16 accounts.</p> <p>17 Q. Prior to the City putting its plan of adjustment 18 before the Court, did you ever talk to anyone from the 19 City about the -- their proposed plan of adjustment?</p> <p>20 A. And by the City in this case, do you mean the 21 emergency manager, the mayor, their delegates? I mean, 22 I'm trying to --</p> <p>23 Q. Let's take it -- let's break it down. I don't want to 24 try -- I'll try not to be confusing with it.</p>
Page 62	Page 64
<p style="text-align: center;">RIP RAPSON</p> <p>1 relate to the investments that the emergency manager 2 is proposing be directed toward some of these major 3 community building blocks of safety, and blight, and 4 information technology, and the like.</p> <p>5 Q. With respect to any testimony you might give at the 6 plan of adjustment trial, have you been asked to be 7 called upon as an expert witness on any topic?</p> <p>8 A. No, not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>9 Q. Have you ever been designated an expert witness for 10 any legal matter?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you consider yourself, and I've seen you listed at 13 least general -- at some talking sessions and meetings 14 as an expert in urban policy. Would you consider 15 yourself as an expert in urban policy for this 16 particular bankruptcy?</p> <p>17 MR. KURZWEIL: Object to the form of that 18 question.</p> <p>19 A. I apologize, I don't know how an expert is certified. 20 I would be quite sure that I would not be in that 21 category, but I would say, and this may not be 22 relevant to what you're asking, that I've spent 25 23 years working in urban affairs and feel that a 24 combination of professional and personal experience</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RIP RAPSON</p> <p>1 A. Yeah.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you have, did you have any input into the plan of 3 adjustment before -- as it was being formulated?</p> <p>4 A. I think I'd have to say no.</p> <p>5 Q. Prior to the filing of the first plan of adjustment, 6 did you speak with Kevyn Orr, the emergency manager, 7 about any of the details of the proposed plan of 8 adjustment?</p> <p>9 A. I had the opportunity on a couple of occasions to 10 speak with Kevyn Orr, but it was never about the 11 particulars of what would go into a plan of 12 adjustment. I've never had a conversation with him 13 about the particulars of the plan of adjustment.</p> <p>14 Q. Did Mr. -- has Mr. Orr, had he ever asked you to 15 provide any input into the proposed plan of adjustment 16 before it was filed?</p> <p>17 A. He never -- I don't recall his ever making a request 18 of that kind. He did, though, on a number of 19 occasions speak with me and others at Kresge about 20 what we were doing, where our investments were going, 21 where we felt the greatest assistance might come from 22 the City, from City government, given where our 23 investment portfolio had been and might go.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you remember if any of those meetings took place</p>

RIP RAPSON

1 Q. Are you aware, one way or the other, whether anyone at
2 Conway MacKenzie has reviewed the Detroit Future City
3 plan?

4 A. I do not know.

5 Q. I want to talk about the Grand Bargain a little bit,
6 with this caveat. I understand there's a mediation in
7 order. Are you aware of the mediation order?

8 A. I have been made aware of that, yes.

9 Q. When did you become aware of that?

10 A. Most recently, yesterday. I just didn't know what the
11 mediation order meant, and I still don't think I do
12 know what it means.

13 Q. And with this entire conversation, the caveat, of
14 course, goes with what I've said before, which is to
15 the extent you and your personal lawyer, Kresge's
16 lawyers had discussions even outside of the mediation,
17 I don't want to get into the substance of those
18 conversations.

19 But prior to yesterday, did you have any
20 understanding with respect to whether or not the
21 Kresge Foundation's involvement with the Grand
22 Bargain, whether those conversations or that happened
23 during the process leading up to the Grand Bargain --

24 A. I see.

RIP RAPSON

2 A. It was in a, a dinner conversation I had with him.
3 Q. And during this dinner conversation, this is when
4 Judge Rosen proposed that the Kresge Foundation become
5 involved with the Grand Bargain, is that fair?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And I've reviewed on YouTube, of all places, a speech
8 that you gave at Wayne State University -- maybe not a
9 speech, but it certainly was a formal type speech, and
10 do you remember that, that address?
11 A. I do.
12 Q. Okay. Do you remember when that was?
13 A. It was, what, I don't know, two-and-a-half months ago,
14 I think.
15 Q. And during that address to the audience, you
16 referenced your initial conversations with Mr. Rosen,
17 is that fair, with Judge Rosen?
18 A. I don't recall, but if it's on YouTube, I'll take your
19 word for it.
20 Q. And we thought about bringing it in and playing it for
21 you.
22 A. Oh, that would have really been torture.
23 Q. Tell me if I'm right. When Judge -- during your first
24 conversation with Judge Rosen, where he proposed that
25 the Kresge Foundation become involved in the process

RIP RAPSON

for the Grand Bargain, was it Judge Rosen who brought up that the involvement of the foundation should occur because it could soften the blow to the pensioners and help preserve the collection at the DIA?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection. This calls for communications between Judge Rosen and Mr. Rapson. I believe this falls within the construct of the mediation order, and I would ask that the witness be instructed not to answer.

If you have specific parts of the YouTube video or Mr. Rapson's statements you would want to ask him about, that's a different story. But I think when you get to the back and forth between Mr. Rapson and Judge Rosen, you are intruding into the area protected by the mediation order.

MR. KURZWEIL: Under those circumstances, I'm going to instruct the witness not to answer that specific question.

BY MR. MCCARTHY:

Q. And is it fair to assume that you will follow those instructions and not answer questions based on the mediation order with respect to your initial back-and-forth conversations with Judge Rosen at your initial meeting with him?

RIP RAPSON

- A. Yes.
- Q. Let me try to reframe it and see if we can do it that way. If not, I understand.

At 10 minutes and 45 seconds into the speech that you gave at Wayne State University on the topic of the bankruptcy, you noted to the audience that Judge Rosen asked you specifically to get involved within the Grand Bargain in order to, quote, soften the blow that pensioners might be forced to take.

Do you remember that?

MR. SHUMAKER: I'm going to object on the same line. You can ask whether he made that statement at Wayne State, but you cannot ask whether in fact that was something that Judge Rosen said to him.

MR. KURZWEIL: I'll instruct the witness not to answer that particular question.

BY MR. MCCARTHY:

Q. And you'll follow those instructions based on the mediation order?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did you make the following statement at Wayne State in your address regarding, in part, the Detroit bankruptcy, quote: So he said, and he being Judge

RIP RAPSON

Rosen, what I want to propose is that the foundations come to the table with a solution that helps avoid having to litigate those two issues, and the solution, of course, that you all have become familiar with since then is sort of the Grand Bargain, or what he for a while was calling the art trust, in which we would try to identify an amount of money that would be sufficient to help soften the blow that the pensioners might be forced to take, and we would also try to figure out an amount that would be -- constitute sufficient consideration for the transfer of the art into a new non-profit and sort of take those issues off the table.

MR. KURZWEIL: Counsel, without asking to let me see a copy, are you representing that that's a complete recitation of the words spoken by the witness?

MR. McCARTHY: I am, Counsel. We attempted to do our best to translate what was said at that YouTube in to this direct quote, and the direct quote was written for me from the good folks at my office.

MR. SHUMAKER: Then I would suggest that the witness can answer whether he recalls making the statement as Mr. McCarthy has articulated.

Exhibit 2

1 DAN GILBERT
2 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
3 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
4
5
6 In re:) Chapter 9
7 CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,) Case No. 13-53846
8 Debtor.) Hon. Steven W. Rhodes
9
10 _____
11
12
13 The Videotaped Deposition of DAN GILBERT,
14 Taken at 4000 Town Center, Suite 1800,
15 Southfield, Michigan,
16 Commencing at 9:46 a.m.,
17 Tuesday, July 29, 2014,
18 Before Cheri L. Poplin, CSR-5132, RPR, CRR.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 you would interact with cities on, you know, it's a 3 burdensome, cumbersome, frustrating process that has 4 not -- there's not a single point of contact. You 5 know, there's, you know -- one department may not know 6 what the other department is doing. There's probably 7 a lack of manpower. There's not enough personnel. 8 Their systems are -- their technology systems are 9 wholly inadequate if they exist at all. So just there 10 needs to be a significant investment in all that -- 11 those areas.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you know how -- what's your experience with 13 Detroit's business environment versus other cities 14 that you've done business in?</p> <p>15 A. Well, we are -- as far as major cities go, I mean, 16 we're -- there's only a couple other major cities that 17 we have significant operations in, so I don't have a 18 lot of direct experience, but the -- you know, the 19 City of Detroit with its city income tax for, you 20 know, companies and people, the tax structure, you 21 know, versus even suburban cities is -- is not 22 competitive. You know, and -- and as far as how 23 they -- how the -- how the businesses interact and how 24 they -- how they, you know, help businesses do what 25 they do -- or not help do what they do, not get in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 park system?</p> <p>3 A. I'm not aware of any, no.</p> <p>4 Q. Have you looked at the city services that the City 5 intends to provide after bankruptcy?</p> <p>6 A. As it -- like in this document? No. I have not 7 studied that yet.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So you haven't looked at the level of services 9 that the City intends to provide?</p> <p>10 A. No. I mean, I'm assuming there's experts that have 11 done that and -- you know, but I don't -- I don't know 12 yet.</p> <p>13 Q. That's just not you?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. And you haven't talked to those experts; right?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, you recently donated to the DIA as part of the 18 Grand Bargain; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Is that the first time you've ever donated to the DIA?</p> <p>21 A. No. I don't -- I don't think so. I don't know if 22 there's been significant donations, contributions, but 23 it's probably not the first time, no.</p> <p>24 Q. And this -- this donation occurred a couple weeks ago; 25 is that right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 way of what they do is -- is -- does not stand up to 3 other cities in my experience.</p> <p>4 Q. And do you know what changes the -- the City of 5 Detroit is currently making or intends to make to 6 improve the business environment?</p> <p>7 A. Yeah. I mean, I don't have -- you know, the Mayor's 8 only been in office whatever, six months, so I don't 9 have the specific changes. I do know that he's got 10 a -- his right-hand man. What's his name? Lewand. 11 Tom Lewand is -- heads up -- is trying to head up 12 the -- the whole sort of recalibration of the 13 departments and the way businesses interact with those 14 departments and how things get done, so -- but I just 15 have not seen yet what his progress is.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So specifically you just don't know what the -- 17 the steps the City has taken to improve the business 18 culture?</p> <p>19 A. Not yet, no.</p> <p>20 Q. Oh, and sorry to go back to this. Do you know what 21 changes the City is making to -- to improve the -- the 22 park system?</p> <p>23 A. Well, the one -- the big one we talked about, handing 24 over Belle Isle to the City on a lease.</p> <p>25 Q. Any other changes you know the City is making to the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 A. Yeah. I think it was agreed to before a couple weeks 3 ago. It may even have been formalized a couple weeks 4 ago.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you know when it was agreed to?</p> <p>6 A. Six weeks, eight weeks, something like that. I mean, 7 I don't want to say agreed. They just came and 8 solicited us and we said we'd participate verbally.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And to the extent you can dial it in -- dial it 10 in, do you know when -- you said they came and talked 11 to you about --</p> <p>12 A. Um-hmm.</p> <p>13 Q. -- donating to the Grand Bargain. Do you know when 14 that was?</p> <p>15 A. When that was?</p> <p>16 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>17 A. Yeah. I said roughly six, eight weeks ago, something 18 like that.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Say May, then? Does that sound about right?</p> <p>20 A. Sounds about right.</p> <p>21 Q. And prior to May of 2014, understanding that's an 22 approximate date, did you have any discussions with 23 the DIA about the Grand Bargain?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And prior to May 2014, did you have any</p>

Pages 122 to 125

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
 950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

1 DAN GILBERT
 2 discussions with the mediators that have been
 3 appointed in this case?
 4 **A. Who are the mediators?**
 5 Q. Okay. Well, let me ask a better question. Are you
 6 aware that this -- in this bankruptcy the Court has
 7 appointed mediators to help out?
 8 **A. I think I've read that, yes.**
 9 Q. Okay. Have you had -- and Judge Rosen is one of those
 10 mediators?
 11 **A. Yeah.**
 12 Q. Okay. Have you had any conversations with Judge Rosen
 13 about the Grand Bargain?
 14 **A. Yeah. He called me up.**
 15 Q. Okay.
 16 **A. Well, let me see was it about the Grand Bargain. I**
 17 **know he called me up and asked me to attend some**
 18 **event. I can't recall whether it was about**
 19 **specifically -- no. I don't -- I don't think he -- we**
 20 **talked about the Grand Bargain actually.**
 21 Q. Have you had any conversations with Judge Rosen about
 22 the case in general?
 23 **A. Yeah. In general. And that phone call when he called**
 24 **me, how's it going, what do you think, you know, that**
 25 **kind of thing.**

1 DAN GILBERT
 2 Q. Okay.
 3 **A. Might be Driker. I just don't know.**
 4 Q. Okay.
 5 **A. I don't think it is. I think this guy -- Driker is a**
 6 **Wayne State guy. I think he -- he worked at Comerica**
 7 **before this.**
 8 Q. And do you know if you've had any conversations with
 9 any of the other mediators besides that one
 10 conversation with Judge Rosen?
 11 **A. Who's the other mediators?**
 12 Q. So as far as you know, no?
 13 **A. Well, yeah. I've got to know their names so I can**
 14 **tell you.**
 15 Q. Okay. But it was never in -- to be honest, I don't
 16 have them off the top of my head either. But as far
 17 as you know, there were never any conversations with
 18 mediators about the bankruptcy case; is that right?
 19 MR. SHUMAKER: That he had?
 20 MR. ARNAULT: Yeah. That he had.
 21 **A. Yeah. You know, until I know the names of the people**
 22 **I don't want to go on record and say that, so I**
 23 **don't . . .**
 24 BY MR. ARNAULT:
 25 Q. Sure. That's fair. And who were you first contacted

1 DAN GILBERT
 2 Q. Okay. But he didn't ask you to donate to the Grand
 3 Bargain?
 4 **A. I don't believe so. No. Because I know he didn't**
 5 **because that was -- the person who came in was the guy**
 6 **that runs the -- well, he's the -- he doesn't run it.**
 7 **He's the non-paid chairman. I don't know his name.**
 8 THE WITNESS: Do you guys know his name?
 9 MR. SHUMAKER: From the DIA?
 10 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
 11 **A. He came in. If I heard his name, I'd know it.**
 12 BY MR. ARNAULT:
 13 Q. I don't know. So this was --
 14 MR. SHUMAKER: Gargaro?
 15 THE WITNESS: No. It's not him. He
 16 runs -- it's the other guy. The guy who's -- Gene --
 17 the other Gene. Gene --
 18 BY MR. ARNAULT:
 19 Q. Driker?
 20 **A. No, no, no. Maybe. I don't know. I've got to get --**
 21 **I'm sorry.**
 22 Q. That's all right.
 23 **A. He's the -- he's like the -- he's like the chairman of**
 24 **the board. He doesn't work there. He's like the**
 25 **nonprofit chairman of the board guy.**

1 DAN GILBERT
 2 by about donating to the Grand Bargain?
 3 **A. Yeah. This was Gene -- I'm going to get you his name.**
 4 Q. Okay. Yeah. Yeah.
 5 **A. Want his name?**
 6 Q. Sure.
 7 **A. You can ask the que -- I'll just keep talking.**
 8 MR. SHUMAKER: Is it Graham?
 9 BY MR. ARNAULT:
 10 Q. Was it Graham Beal?
 11 **A. Yes. That's it.**
 12 Q. All right. There we go.
 13 **A. Did I say Gene?**
 14 Q. Yeah.
 15 **A. Graham.**
 16 Q. Okay.
 17 **A. Graham Beal.**
 18 Q. So Graham Beal called you in about May 2014 asking you
 19 to donate to the Grand Bargain?
 20 **A. Yeah. He said to come into the -- he wanted to meet,**
 21 **come to the office, and when he came to the office, he**
 22 **talked about it, yes.**
 23 Q. Okay.
 24 **A. And Matt Cullen was in the meeting with me from my**
 25 **office.**

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And what did he say about donating to the Grand 3 Bargain when you had this meeting with him?</p> <p>4 MR. SHUMAKER: I'm going to object because 5 I believe that any of these discussions would have 6 been covered by the mediation order, and, as you know, 7 Judge Rhodes has indicated that there are not going to 8 be communications revealed in connection with those 9 mediations, and so I think this is off limits.</p> <p>10 MR. ARNAULT: Okay. So your position is 11 that Mr. Gilbert was part of the -- the mediation?</p> <p>12 MR. SHUMAKER: Yes. I -- I believe that's 13 correct.</p> <p>14 MR. ARNAULT: Okay. And you're going to 15 instruct him not to answer any questions about what 16 was discussed during the meeting with Mr. Beal?</p> <p>17 MR. SHUMAKER: His personal attorney can do 18 that, but that is our position, yes.</p> <p>19 MR. ARNAULT: Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. SHUMAKER: The City's position.</p> <p>21 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>22 Q. After that meeting in May 2014, did you have any other 23 meetings with the DIA or anyone about the Grand 24 Bargain?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 A. No. I don't think so. I don't think I -- I can't 3 tell you for sure, you know, recollection of dates. 4 But I do believe that the meeting was likely the first 5 time that I heard the specifics about it or, you know.</p> <p>6 Q. And the first time that you were approached about it?</p> <p>7 A. Yeah.</p> <p>8 Q. Why did you decide to donate to the Grand Bargain?</p> <p>9 A. Well, we -- we're heavily invested in the City of 10 Detroit and its well-being and, you know, they're 11 asking us to participate along with other businesses 12 and foundations and -- and companies that if we could, 13 you know, have a way where the -- these pensioners 14 could get their -- you know, most of their pensions 15 and we could also move the DIA outside of the assets 16 of the City, as it probably should have been done a 17 long time ago. You know, it's hard to sort of say no 18 to that based on our position where we're at.</p> <p>19 Q. So you understood when you agreed to donate that you 20 would be helping to save the art in the DIA; is that 21 right?</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>23 A. First of all, my understanding reading this stuff, 24 there may be zero legal authority, anyway, for -- for 25 those assets to be subject to bankruptcy, so I'm not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 Q. Did you agree at that meeting to donate to the Grand 3 Bargain?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And I assume you were aware of that back in November 6 or early 2013 when the Grand Bargain was first 7 materializing? Were you aware of that?</p> <p>8 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>9 A. Aware -- I don't understand the question.</p> <p>10 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>11 Q. Well, did you see any -- prior to the point in time 12 when you donated, did you see any media reports about 13 the -- the formation of the Grand Bargain and the fact 14 that all these foundations were contributing?</p> <p>15 A. I -- I really can't recall whether the meeting is the 16 first time I heard it or I read it -- I'm sure it was 17 all around the same time. I just can't recall.</p> <p>18 Q. There was never a point in time when the media reports 19 came out and you saw that all these foundations were 20 donating and made the decision or decided not -- not 21 to donate?</p> <p>22 A. That -- that I made the decision not to donate?</p> <p>23 Q. Yeah. Or you just -- you decided -- you didn't see 24 that and say, well, maybe I should donate to the Grand 25 Bargain?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 sure that that's a great way to characterize it. We 3 were saving -- the safer thing for sure would be to 4 move it outside of the City.</p> <p>5 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. So you understood that when you were donating, 7 you were helping to transfer the assets in the DIA 8 outside the City? Would that be a better way to put 9 it?</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>12 A. Say -- say that again.</p> <p>13 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>14 Q. You understood that when you were donating money to 15 the Grand Bargain that the money would be used to 16 transfer the DIA assets out of the City? Would that 17 be a fair way to put it?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Same objection.</p> <p>19 MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.</p> <p>20 A. Yeah. I think going -- I think the way it was 21 presented was going forward in time and as part of 22 this agreement and all the creditors and the judge, 23 that that would be the case and the results of this 24 would be that the museum would then sit outside going 25 forward. Yeah.</p>

Pages 130 to 133

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So you understood that the art in the DIA was</p> <p>4 part of the Grand Bargain; would that be fair?</p> <p>5 A. I don't understand the question, if the art was part</p> <p>6 of it.</p> <p>7 Q. Or that it was one of the components of the Grand</p> <p>8 Bargain?</p> <p>9 A. Still -- I don't understand the question.</p> <p>10 Q. Would you have entered into the Grand Bargain if one</p> <p>11 of the terms of the Grand Bargain was that -- actually</p> <p>12 strike that.</p> <p>13 Would you have entered into the Grand</p> <p>14 Bargain if the art was not being transferred as part</p> <p>15 of the Grand Bargain?</p> <p>16 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Object to form.</p> <p>18 A. I don't know how to answer that question. The way it</p> <p>19 was presented to us was this is how it's all going to</p> <p>20 work, do you want to be in or out, and we said</p> <p>21 we'll -- yeah, we'll participate, so I can't speculate</p> <p>22 to possibilities of things.</p> <p>23 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. It was essentially here's the structure, are</p> <p>25 you going to agree or not agree; is that right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Object to form.</p> <p>3 A. So where would it go? I mean, I guess I would ask the</p> <p>4 question if it wasn't there, I would say, okay, well,</p> <p>5 where -- where is it going to go to?</p> <p>6 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>7 Q. Would you have contributed money to the Grand Bargain</p> <p>8 if some of the money went to pay the debts of the</p> <p>9 City's other financial creditors?</p> <p>10 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 A. I'd have to understand who the creditors were and</p> <p>13 what -- I -- I guess there's thousands of creditors;</p> <p>14 right? I don't -- so I'd need to know more specifics</p> <p>15 for -- to answer that question.</p> <p>16 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Would you have contributed money to the Grand</p> <p>18 Bargain if some of the money went to pay the debts of</p> <p>19 the insurers who insure the City's Certificates of</p> <p>20 Participation?</p> <p>21 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>23 MR. SHUMAKER: Calls for hypothetical.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: So do you want me to answer</p> <p>25 the question?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 A. Yeah. I mean, they didn't say it like -- you know,</p> <p>3 that way, but they said here's -- here's -- here's</p> <p>4 what we want to do here, here's how it's going to all</p> <p>5 work, here's who we think is going to participate,</p> <p>6 would you guys participate at this level, and we said</p> <p>7 yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you propose any changes to the structure of the</p> <p>9 deal?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. And did you understand that the money you provided</p> <p>12 would go directly to the retirees?</p> <p>13 A. Yeah. I believe it was -- it was presented that way</p> <p>14 to us, that this will hel -- again, I can't recall the</p> <p>15 word for word, it was a verbal thing, but this would</p> <p>16 help save the majority of the -- the pensioners'</p> <p>17 pensions and they were at the same time moving forward</p> <p>18 forever, so if this -- you know, in the one in a</p> <p>19 million chance this happened again, it would -- you</p> <p>20 know, it wouldn't even be a question as to the assets</p> <p>21 being outside of the City.</p> <p>22 Q. Would you have entered into the Grand Bargain if the</p> <p>23 money you contributed did not go directly to the</p> <p>24 retirees?</p> <p>25 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 MR. SHUMAKER: Go ahead.</p> <p>3 A. No. You know, to think that sophisticated Wall Street</p> <p>4 insurance companies and investors who knew the City of</p> <p>5 Detroit was in dire financial straits for decades and</p> <p>6 took a risk in insuring those bonds and -- would I</p> <p>7 personally have invested money into a scheme that</p> <p>8 would get them part of the recovery? No. The answer</p> <p>9 is no.</p> <p>10 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And you say that sophisticated Wall Street</p> <p>12 banks and companies who invested in the City of</p> <p>13 Detroit.</p> <p>14 A. Um-hmm.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know what information they were provided in</p> <p>16 connection with those investments?</p> <p>17 A. No. I would assume that they were provided whatever</p> <p>18 is required by the law. I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q. But you haven't looked at exactly what was provided?</p> <p>20 A. No. No.</p> <p>21 Q. And you don't know what representations were made by</p> <p>22 the City to those financial creditors?</p> <p>23 A. No. I'm sure they did their due diligence, though.</p> <p>24 Q. Would you have contributed money to the Grand Bargain</p> <p>25 if some of the money was earmarked to demolish blight</p>

Pages 134 to 137

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 in the City? 3 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. 4 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form. 5 A. I mean, I guess, you know, these questions I -- I -- I would need to know, you know, would it -- would it have pensioners, too, and -- I mean, I -- you know, I don't -- I don't know what to say. I mean, I -- I have to think about it and understand the whole thing before I would comment, you know. 11 BY MR. ARNAULT: 12 Q. So besides the DIA aspect of the Grand Bargain and the 13 retiree -- the money going to the retirees, which 14 we've discussed, are there any other reasons that you 15 decided to donate to the Grand Bargain? 16 A. Can you -- can you repeat the two? 17 Q. Sure. So we talked about the -- the transfer of the 18 DIA assets, -- 19 A. Um-hmm. 20 Q. -- the money going directly to the retirees. 21 A. Yeah. And if it helped end this entire bankruptcy and got us out faster, quicker so Detroit can move forward, that would be another reason, if it accelerated the process, too, so probably those three. 25 Q. So you believe that it's a bad thing that the City is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 BY MR. ARNAULT: 3 Q. And why do you think faster would be better for terms 4 of getting out of the bankruptcy? 5 A. It's like being -- I mean, I think the faster you get out of a dentist chair is probably the better too. It's probably the same thing. I don't know what -- sort of -- that's a <i>prima facie</i> sort of response. Right? It's like why would you want to be in bankruptcy if you can be out of bankruptcy? 11 Q. I take it that based on your willingness to contribute 12 to the Grand Bargain that you believe that art 13 provides certain benefits to society; would that be 14 fair? 15 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form. 16 A. Do I believe that art benefits -- yeah. I probably believe that art benefits society. 18 BY MR. ARNAULT: 19 Q. And what types of benefits do you believe that art 20 provides to society? 21 A. I think art is inspirational. I think it's an enhancement to the -- the culture and the destination 23 nature of a -- of a city. I think it -- I think it brings in, you know, excitement and -- and people. 25 Q. Any other benefits that art provides to society you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 in bankruptcy right now? 3 A. No. I actually think it's a -- it's a -- unfortunately, as painful as it is, I think it's a good thing. 6 Q. Why do you say that? 7 A. Because investment doesn't come into anywhere when there's uncertainty. And while there's a potential of bankruptcy looming over a city, you just don't get outside investment to come in. You don't get interest. But when -- when you file a bankruptcy in sort of a -- although the bankruptcy is not completed, it's the end -- when it's the end -- I mean, it's the beginning of the end and there's no other shoe really to drop, you start getting a little bit more certainty and then more investment comes into the City and people at least know where it's going. 18 Q. So it's not a bad thing that the City entered the 19 bankruptcy, but it sounds like you believe that the 20 City needs to emerge from bankruptcy as soon as 21 possible? 22 A. Sure. 23 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the form. 24 A. Yeah. You know, the faster -- you know, faster would be better. Sure.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 can think of? 3 A. You know, I -- I'd have to think more about it, but those are -- that's what comes to mind. 5 Q. Okay. And do you believe that the DIA provides these 6 benefits to the City of Detroit? 7 A. Yeah. I think it's, you know, one of the -- one of the most, what is it, prestigious or -- or -- or top 9 art institutions in the country, if not the world, is 10 my understanding. I'm not a -- I'm not a huge -- I 11 don't have a huge background in art, so I don't 12 really -- I don't know that much about it, but that's 13 my understanding. 14 Q. So you think the DIA is an important museum; would 15 that be fair? 16 A. Yeah. 17 Q. Do you know how many people visit the DIA each year? 18 A. I -- I guess close to half a million, but I don't know. Three, four, 500,000. Something like that. 20 Q. What's that guess based on? Just a guess? 21 A. Yeah. I'm sure there's an accurate number you can go find. 23 Q. Yeah. Do you know how many people from outside of 24 Detroit visit the DIA each year? 25 A. Outside of the City?</p>

Pages 138 to 141

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 Q. Outside of the City of Detroit.</p> <p>3 A. Like versus the 700,000 people who live in the City?</p> <p>4 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>5 A. No. I don't know the number.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you believe that the DIA is a tourist attraction?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know. I don't know what that would be</p> <p>8 consider -- I don't know what numbers you need to call</p> <p>9 it that.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you think people visit Detroit specifically to</p> <p>11 visit the DIA?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sure there's people that do. I just don't know</p> <p>13 the number that do.</p> <p>14 Q. And why do you say you're sure that people do visit</p> <p>15 Detroit specifically to visit the DIA?</p> <p>16 A. Because it's my understanding or reading it's a, you</p> <p>17 know, known art institution that's one of the -- has a</p> <p>18 prestigious collection and there's probably things in</p> <p>19 there if you're into that kind of thing that you can</p> <p>20 only go there to see. So I make an assumption that</p> <p>21 people come to see it.</p> <p>22 Q. But you don't know specifically how many people come?</p> <p>23 A. I don't know the numbers.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you believe that the DIA provides economic benefits</p> <p>25 to the City of Detroit?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 Q. And you don't know the total value of the DIA</p> <p>3 collection?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you know how much each of the City's creditors is</p> <p>6 set to receive under the current plan?</p> <p>7 A. Each creditor?</p> <p>8 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>9 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know if pensioners are receiving greater</p> <p>11 recoveries than bondholders?</p> <p>12 MR. PATTWELL: Objection. Form and</p> <p>13 foundation.</p> <p>14 A. I -- that's my understanding reading articles, yes,</p> <p>15 that the pensioners are receiving a higher percentage</p> <p>16 of what they are owed than other creditors.</p> <p>17 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>18 Q. And do you believe that it's necessary for the City to</p> <p>19 provide greater recoveries to pensioners than to</p> <p>20 bondholders, for example?</p> <p>21 MR. PATTWELL: Objection to form.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>23 A. Yeah. Well, I don't know that, you know, necessary is</p> <p>24 the -- the word. You know, I don't know what your</p> <p>25 definition again of necessary is. What do you mean by</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 A. I'm sure there's some benefits. I couldn't tell you</p> <p>3 what they were. But when you have several hundred</p> <p>4 thousand people visiting a location during the year,</p> <p>5 there's automatically going to be benefits.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. But you don't know exactly what those benefits</p> <p>7 are?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. You haven't seen any studies analyzing the economic</p> <p>10 impact of the DIA on the City of Detroit?</p> <p>11 A. I have not seen any, no.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware that Christie's valued some of the art</p> <p>13 in the DIA?</p> <p>14 A. I read about that, yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you reviewed that valuation?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Are you aware that the Attorney General has published</p> <p>18 an opinion regarding the sale of the art in the DIA?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you looked at the total value of the DIA</p> <p>21 collection?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. So you've never attempted to determine the total value</p> <p>24 of the DIA collection?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 that, necessary?</p> <p>3 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>4 Q. Does the City need to provide greater --</p> <p>5 A. Does it -- does it have to? Does it need to? Does</p> <p>6 it -- should it? Is that -- I'm trying to understand.</p> <p>7 Q. Is it essential that the City provide greater</p> <p>8 recoveries to pensioners than bondholders?</p> <p>9 A. Well, yeah. I mean, I think that when you're --</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 A. When you're dealing with \$25,000-a-year pensioners who</p> <p>12 relied on -- you know, working primarily blue collar</p> <p>13 jobs and relied on a promise of receiving a pension</p> <p>14 when they retired after many years of service versus</p> <p>15 sophisticated Wall Street investors who knew the risk</p> <p>16 of investing in a city like Detroit, yeah, I think,</p> <p>17 you know, overall fairness, morality, and ethical</p> <p>18 judgment, it would probably be -- yeah, I think they</p> <p>19 probably deserve to receive more than the creditors.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. So sounds like you believe that the pensioners</p> <p>21 deserve to receive more than the financial creditors</p> <p>22 because of their respective financial positions; --</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. -- would that be fair?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

Pages 142 to 145

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
 950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 MR. PATTWELL: Objection. Form.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>4 MR. PATTWELL: Mischaracterizes testimony.</p> <p>5 A. No. That's not what I said.</p> <p>6 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection. Form.</p> <p>9 A. I said based on the -- their position in society and life and their -- the expectation and the -- when comparing creditors to creditors, I guess you call the pensioners creditors, you know, who is in a better position to analyze the risk associated with the City of Detroit, I would say the pensioners are in a -- in a worse position than -- by far than the sophisticated Wall Street investor, yes.</p> <p>10 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>11 Q. And why do you say that the pensioners were in a worse position to evaluate the City of Detroit?</p> <p>12 A. Well, I'm not sure a guy picking up trash who is promised a pension is familiar with detailed financial disclosures or even gets that for when he decides in his incentive to work as a -- let's say a garbage pickup man.</p> <p>13 Q. And what's the basis for that understanding?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 financial condition when they accepted jobs with the City of Detroit?</p> <p>3 A. No. I didn't ask that question to them.</p> <p>4 Q. And then I think we briefly touched on this earlier, but you said that financial creditors were in a better position to assess the City of Detroit's financial condition; would that be fair?</p> <p>5 A. That would be my opinion, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And that's your opinion based on your previous business dealings and when you've conducted due diligence for deals; is that right?</p> <p>7 A. Let's put it this way. I think the fireman is in a better position to put out the fire than the Wall Street executive who's analyzing portfolios, so, you know, it's just -- it's just what they do for a living. Right? That's what they do for a living. A fireman isn't, in essence, doing his pension for a living. This is what -- you know, these -- these guys are investing. That's what they're -- or evaluating risk as part of -- that's what their primary duties are of their job, so I'm going to make that assumption pretty confidently.</p> <p>8 Q. Sure. But, again, you're not aware of what exactly the City provided to its financial creditors regarding</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 A. Prima facie.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. Okay. And then I also -- you know, when you compare that to a sophisticated Wall Street investor who's analyzing various disclosure statements and determining do I invest in Detroit or St. Louis or Google stock or whatever it might be, I would assume that the sophistication of that kind of investor is -- is way higher to evaluate the risks than the garbage pickup man in my example.</p> <p>5 Q. Sure. And --</p> <p>6 A. And the policeman and fireman and whoever else.</p> <p>7 Q. Sure. And have you talked to pensioners about what their expectation was regarding pensions?</p> <p>8 A. Have I had specific -- yeah. I have had a couple talks with them.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Who is that, then?</p> <p>10 A. There's a fireman I had a talk with. There's a policeman I had a talk with. I can't remember their names.</p> <p>11 Q. Sure. And they said that they expected to receive pensions from the City of Detroit?</p> <p>12 A. Yeah. Yeah. That was part of their deal.</p> <p>13 Q. And did you ask them if they were aware of the City's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT</p> <p>2 its financial condition?</p> <p>3 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>5 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>6 Q. Finally -- actually I just want to make sure that we cover all this. Are there any other reasons besides the ones we've talked about why you think it's necessary for the City to provide pensioners with greater recoveries than financial creditors?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form.</p> <p>8 A. Yeah. First of all, you guys have to educate me. I'm not sure -- the City doesn't decide what's right. It's the bankruptcy judge who decides what's right, so I don't know --</p> <p>9 BY MR. ARNAULT:</p> <p>10 Q. But the City initially makes the decision to determine how much to pay the creditors.</p> <p>11 A. So -- so one more time with the question.</p> <p>12 Q. Sure. Sure. Sure. So we've talked about expectations, ability to evaluate the financial condition.</p> <p>13 A. Um-hmm.</p> <p>14 Q. And I just want to know if there are any other reasons why you think it's necessary for the City to pay the</p>

Pages 146 to 149

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 pensioners more than the creditors. 3 A. No. I mean, I -- I think I -- 4 MR. PATTWELL: Objection to form. 5 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Form. 6 A. I think I answered the questions already. Yeah. 7 BY MR. ARNAULT: 8 Q. Okay. I just wanted to make sure there was nothing 9 else. 10 A. Okay. Yeah. 11 Q. Finally, it's -- it's my understanding that you and 12 your companies own a number of buildings in Detroit; 13 is that right? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Okay. Do you know how many buildings in Detroit you 16 and your companies currently own? 17 A. Approximately 60. 18 Q. Okay. This is about eight million square feet of 19 land; is that right? 20 A. Well, it's not square feet of land. It's square feet 21 of the structures. And I think that eight million 22 figure also includes the square footage of actually 23 the garages themselves. 24 Q. And you've spent about 1.3 billion buying and 25 renovating property in Detroit?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 sound about right? 3 A. Yeah. We started in 2010, but it probably -- I think 4 probably get to -- Richard, about 2012 probably. It's 5 probably till late 2012 before all of the team members 6 in the suburbs were downtown. 7 Q. And how many employees are currently downtown? 8 A. All the businesses, including Greektown and Quicken 9 Loans, about 12,500, 13,000, something like that. 10 Q. And in some of the articles that I've read, I've heard 11 you frame your reinvestment in Detroit as both doing 12 good and doing well. 13 A. It would actually be doing well by doing good. 14 Q. Doing well by doing good. 15 A. Yeah. 16 Q. And when you say doing good, you mean that your 17 investment in Detroit is good for the City and the 18 people? 19 A. Well, yeah. We often get that -- and I don't go out 20 just like saying that. I usually get a question -- 21 Q. Sure. 22 A. -- saying are you doing this because it's just like an 23 altruistic thing and you care about the City or you're 24 just doing this to make profits, and I respond with 25 that statement saying we're doing it for both and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 A. That's -- yeah. It's probably a little higher than 3 that right now, yeah. 4 Q. Okay. 5 A. Somewhere in there. 6 Q. And most of the buildings you own are located in the 7 central business district; is that right? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. And you also own a number located along the Woodward 10 corridor; is that right? 11 A. Yeah. It's -- it's like the -- that's sort of the 12 same thing, yeah. 13 Q. Do you know how many buildings you own are located 14 along the Woodward corridor? 15 A. Vast majority of them are. I mean, there's a -- 16 there's a handful that are off a block or two, but 17 it's -- it's fairly concentrated. 18 Q. Okay. Would you say about 30 of the 60 are on the 19 Woodward corridor? 20 A. I mean -- that's probably fair. 21 Q. And you also own the Greektown Casino; is that right? 22 A. Yeah. We acquired that a year ago, a little over a 23 year ago. That's not on Woodward corridor. 24 Q. Right. And then you moved Quicken's headquarters from 25 the suburbs to downtown Detroit in 2010. Does that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 DAN GILBERT 2 there's no conflict in them, so . . . 3 Q. Okay. Because you believe that the City of Detroit is 4 currently an undervalued asset; is that right? 5 A. The City itself or -- I mean, I don't know how you -- 6 I mean, investments are very indi -- I don't think you 7 can make a -- I don't think there's such a thing as 8 saying that. I think you've got to say this building, 9 this piece of land, you know, if it's -- whether it's 10 undervalued or not. 11 Q. And the buildings that you've bought in the City of 12 Detroit, would you consider them to be undervalued 13 assets? 14 A. Well, I don't know if they were undervalued at the 15 time that we bought them. I think we probably paid 16 what the market was. I think what we did is we 17 enhanced the value by investing significant dollars 18 oftentimes more than we paid for the building 19 themselves and rehabilitating the buildings and by 20 leasing space in the buildings to ourselves and others 21 to -- to increase the value, so it was by our 22 engagement with it that we added the value. 23 Q. And is it your hope that through this investment that 24 you and your companies will benefit financially? 25 A. Through this investment that we made?</p>

Pages 150 to 153

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

1 **DAN GILBERT**
 2 Q. Through the investment in the City of Detroit.
 3 A. **Yeah. Of course. Then maybe I can contribute to more**
 4 **to the blight gap. What do you think?**
 5 Q. Fair enough.
 6 MR. ARNAULT: Can we go off the record?
 7 MR. SHUMAKER: Sure.
 8 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is 12:32. We
 9 are now off the record.
 10 (Recess taken at 12:32 p.m.)
 11 (Back on the record at 12:41 p.m.)
 12 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We're back on the
 13 record. The time is 12:41.
 14 BY MR. ARNAULT:
 15 Q. Mr. Gilbert, just a few more questions, and apologies
 16 if these have been covered, but . . .
 17 Have you had any conversations with Chief
 18 Craig about the state of the Detroit Police
 19 Department?
 20 A. **I bumped into Chief Craig a couple times at social**
 21 **functions, but not -- nothing significant, no.**
 22 Q. No in-depth conversations?
 23 A. **No.**
 24 Q. And have you -- you're aware that Commissioner Jenkins
 25 is the Commissioner of the Fire Department?

1 **DAN GILBERT**
 2 A. **Is this -- there was a guy from LA that came. Is**
 3 **he -- he's gone; right? There's a new guy. So I**
 4 **don't know. No. I -- no. I don't think so.**
 5 Q. Okay. So no conversations with Commissioner Jenkins,
 6 then?
 7 A. **No. No. No.**
 8 MR. ARNAULT: That is it for questions that
 9 I have.
 10 MR. SHUMAKER: Any other questions?
 11 MR. PATTWELL: No questions.
 12 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: This concludes the
 13 deposition. We're going off the record. The time is
 14 12:42 p.m.
 15 (The deposition was concluded at 12:42 p.m.
 16 Signature of the witness was not requested by
 17 counsel for the respective parties hereto.)
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Exhibit 3

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 3 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN 4 5 6 7 In Re:) Chapter 9 8 9 CITY of DETROIT, MICHIGAN,) Case No. 13-53846 10 11 Debtor.) Hon. Steven Rhodes 12 _____ 13 14 VOLUME 2 15 16 The Videotaped Deposition of KEVYN ORR, 17 in his personal capacity and as Rule 30(b)(6) witness, 18 Taken at 2 Woodward Avenue, 19 Detroit, Michigan, 20 Commencing at 9:10 a.m., 21 Tuesday, July 22, 2014, 22 Before Leisa M. Pastor, CSR-3500, RPR, CRR. 23 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 STEPHEN C. HACKNEY, ESQ. 3 Kirkland & Ellis, LLP 4 300 North Lasalle Street 5 Chicago, Illinois 60654 6 Appearng on behalf of Syncora. 7 8 9 10 JEFFREY BEELAERT, ESQ. 11 Sidley Austin, LLP 12 1501 K Street, N.W. 13 Washington, D.C. 20005 14 Appearng on behalf of National Public Financing. 15 16 17 18 ERNEST J. ESSAD, JR., ESQ. 19 Williams, Williams, Rattner & Plunkett, P.C. 20 380 North Old Woodward Avenue, Suite 300 21 Birmingham, Michigan 48009 22 Appearng on behalf of Financial Guaranty Insurance 23 Company. 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 APPEARANCES: 3 4 GREGORY M. SHUMAKER, ESQ., 5 DAN T. MOSS, ESQ. 6 Jones Day 7 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. 8 Washington, D.C. 20001 9 Appearng on behalf of the Debtor. 10 11 12 13 14 ROBERT HERTZBERG, ESQ. 15 Pepper Hamilton, LLP 16 4000 Town Center, Suite 1800 17 Southfield, Michigan 48075 18 Appearng on behalf of Debtor. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 ALFREDO R. PEREZ, ESQ. 3 Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP 4 700 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700 5 Houston, Texas 77002 6 Appearng on behalf of Financial Guaranty Insurance 7 Company. 8 9 10 11 LISA SCHAPIRA, ESQ. 12 Chadbourne & Parke, LLP 13 30 Rockefeller Plaza 14 New York, New York 10112 15 Appearng on behalf of Assured Guaranty Municipal 16 Corporation. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>

Pages 162 to 165

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 isn't that correct? 3 A. I believe that's correct. 4 Q. Now, you understand that one of the complexities of 5 the case has been that the retirees are -- are kind of 6 disbursed out there in the world, and as a practical 7 matter you've typically been dealing either with 8 retiree associations, retirement trusts, or the 9 official committee of retirees when it came to 10 negotiating plan treatment; is that a fair statement? 11 A. Yes. I think it's a fair statement to say we tried to 12 deal with representative organizations as opposed to 13 individual retirees. 14 Q. The general strategy was you deal with the 15 representative organizations and if you can strike 16 agreements with them, the hope is that they'll then 17 recommend approval of the plan and the retirees will 18 -- will vote consistently with that recommendation, 19 correct? 20 A. Yes, I think that's fair. 21 Q. Now, as of February 21st, 2014, you had just over 22 seven months left on your term; isn't that correct? 23 A. Yes, I think that's fair. 24 Q. Okay. And you said in the press at the time of the 25 first plan that it was quote/unquote crucial that the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 cramdown. We certainly wanted people that were going 3 to be impacted and severely affected by this process 4 to have some level of buy-in for -- for the future of 5 the City and for their interests, I don't want to give 6 the impression that we were merely looking at it from 7 a technical perspective, there is a human dimension 8 here that we were very concerned about, too. 9 Q. But as of the first plan the reason you were so 10 focused and in terms of saying it was crucial to reach 11 agreement, at least as we're talking about retirees, 12 it was because you knew that you couldn't cram them 13 down at the proposed plan levels, correct? 14 A. I knew that we could not cram them down at proposed 15 plan levels, but I think there are plenty of 16 statements out there by me importuning the retirees to 17 support the plan for a number of other reasons, as 18 well. 19 Q. And why couldn't -- why did you believe you couldn't 20 cram them down at the proposed plan levels in the 21 first plan? 22 A. Well, I didn't know if we could get in consultant -- I 23 won't into discussions we had with counsel, but we 24 were concerned that we might not be able to meet some 25 of the requirements in the code but also here again,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 City reach an agreement with its creditors, correct? 3 A. Yes, I believe I said that. 4 Q. And in particular, you were referring to the 5 pensioners, correct? 6 A. I was referring to everyone. 7 Q. Okay. And you also said at that time: "We really do 8 not have time for a lot of acrimony and litigation." 9 Isn't that correct? 10 A. Yes, I probably said that. 11 Q. Okay. Now, you said that it was crucial that the City 12 reach agreement with its creditors in part because 13 time was short on your tenure as emergency manager, 14 correct? 15 A. I suppose you could say in part, but it was also that 16 the City needed to get out of a space that it had been 17 in effectively for almost two years, that we needed to 18 get to revitalization, and I said a bunch of other 19 things during that time about how important it was to 20 get out of this space. 21 Q. And wasn't it also crucial that the retirees agree to 22 the first plan you proposed because you knew you 23 couldn't cram them down at the proposed pension cut 24 levels if they didn't agree? 25 A. There were other reasons, not just the issue regarding</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 wanted to be sure that we addressed the human 3 dimension. 4 Q. And you didn't have -- is it -- are you referring to 5 the fact that as of the first plan, you didn't even 6 have an impaired assenting class? 7 A. I think it's fair to say that we did not have -- well, 8 when was the date? 9 Q. Feb 21, 2014. 10 A. I don't know if that's true because I don't recall the 11 dates that we may have reached agreements with the 12 financial creditors. 13 Q. And when you're talking about the human dimension, 14 what are you talking about there? 15 A. Very simply, and I think I've said this before, the -- 16 the pensioners are people many of whom are in their 17 sixties, seventies, and eighties and don't have an 18 option. They have worked for the City, most of them 19 have done nothing wrong. They are -- the covenant 20 that the City had with its employees and retirees was 21 that if they perform work for the City that upon their 22 retirement they'd be taken care of for the rest of 23 their natural life, that some of this came as quite a 24 shock to them because they had planned their affairs 25 accordingly. Many of them, like my own family members</p>

Pages 198 to 201

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 202</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 or grandmother, wouldn't have options of going back</p> <p>3 into the job market to supplement income or make up</p> <p>4 for some of the cuts and that there were -- there was</p> <p>5 a real-world dimension impact to the people that were</p> <p>6 going to be affected by these cuts.</p> <p>7 Q. Putting aside the human dimension, if you'd had an</p> <p>8 impaired assenting class do you believe that you could</p> <p>9 have crammed down the first plan on the pensioners?</p> <p>10 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>11 A. Yeah, I don't know, I'd have to consult with my</p> <p>12 attorneys.</p> <p>13 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay, and I mean back at the time. Did you believe</p> <p>15 you could or could not?</p> <p>16 A. To be honest with you Mr. Hartley (sic), I don't -- I</p> <p>17 don't -- I don't really recall. I don't really recall</p> <p>18 that being the crux of the discussion, but it might</p> <p>19 have been true.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. You may have thought you could cram them down,</p> <p>21 you may have thought you couldn't, you just don't</p> <p>22 know?</p> <p>23 A. I just don't remember.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. You previously called me Hartley --</p> <p>25 A. Did I call you Hartley?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 204</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 contribution from third parties, meaning the</p> <p>3 foundations, the benefactors and others. We were</p> <p>4 looking, we had been admonished I believe by the court</p> <p>5 on several occasions to be compassionate in our</p> <p>6 treatment of individuals and retirees. And unlike</p> <p>7 financial creditors, the GRS and PFRS unlike some</p> <p>8 financial creditors actually had assets in their</p> <p>9 pension fund, so there was an existing basis by which</p> <p>10 those assets would allow for a higher rate of recovery</p> <p>11 ab initio, that is, from the start, as opposed to the</p> <p>12 financial creditors to whom we owed money but did not</p> <p>13 have a cache of money available to pay them.</p> <p>14 Q. So there -- let me break down what I heard. You tell</p> <p>15 me if I got it right.</p> <p>16 A. Mm-hmm.</p> <p>17 Q. I heard that the basis for the decision to</p> <p>18 discriminate in the first plan was in part the</p> <p>19 compassion for retirees, but it was also in part the</p> <p>20 fact that there were assets in the retirement systems?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay, anything other than those two things?</p> <p>23 A. No, as I said, there are a number of other factors in</p> <p>24 trying to incentivize a workforce, in trying to keep</p> <p>25 the covenant that the City made, a number of other</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 203</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. There is something in your brain --</p> <p>3 A. No, I --</p> <p>4 Q. -- that says Hartley when you see me.</p> <p>5 A. This is going to be surprising, I have a friend named</p> <p>6 Hartley, and he reminds me of you.</p> <p>7 Q. And he's like a handsome, suave guy?</p> <p>8 A. Let's not get carried away.</p> <p>9 Q. Now, you did understand that the February 21st plan of</p> <p>10 adjustment still discriminated in favor of retirees as</p> <p>11 compared to COPs holders in terms of their respective</p> <p>12 recoveries, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I understand that there were -- there were a lot</p> <p>14 of reports and the financial community was taking the</p> <p>15 position that there was discrimination in the plan.</p> <p>16 Q. But there was objectively discrimination in that first</p> <p>17 plan, correct?</p> <p>18 A. There was a higher percentage recovery relative to</p> <p>19 some of the financial creditors.</p> <p>20 Q. And you were aware of that discrimination at the time</p> <p>21 you proposed that plan, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And what was your basis for the level of</p> <p>24 discrimination you proposed in the February 21st plan?</p> <p>25 A. Well, I believe at that point, we were looking at some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 205</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 factors, but generally those are the ones that seem to</p> <p>3 be driving a sort of the treatment of those classes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay, so I heard compassion, the fact that assets</p> <p>5 exist in the retirement trust, trying to incentivize</p> <p>6 City workers. Anything else that justified that level</p> <p>7 of discrimination?</p> <p>8 A. There may have been other things that I said in terms</p> <p>9 of the level of different treatment, you call</p> <p>10 discrimination. That was reported out in the first</p> <p>11 plan, but generally speaking, the principal driving</p> <p>12 force was that the retirement systems had assets in</p> <p>13 them and we were trying to bring levels down below to</p> <p>14 the predictable funding level verse -- based upon the</p> <p>15 unfunded actuarial liability of those funds. You</p> <p>16 start with a cache of money in those funds that are</p> <p>17 available conceivably to pay pensions if you are able</p> <p>18 to adjust the payment levels, whereas with financial</p> <p>19 creditors, we didn't have a cache of money available</p> <p>20 to them. We're paying them out of existing City cash</p> <p>21 flow going forward.</p> <p>22 Q. But you understand that the amount of assets in the</p> <p>23 pension systems, the difference between the amount of</p> <p>24 assets and what is needed to fully fund pensions is</p> <p>25 called the UAAL?</p>

Pages 202 to 205

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And you understand that the pension class sizes were</p> <p>4 for the UAAL, correct?</p> <p>5 A. Well, the pension class sizes were for the UAAL but</p> <p>6 they took into account that those funds had assets in</p> <p>7 them, as well, so you're trying to determine the</p> <p>8 unfunded actuarial liability, but when you try to</p> <p>9 determine the pension payments you also include the</p> <p>10 amount of assets in the funds.</p> <p>11 Q. So the existence of assets in the retirement systems</p> <p>12 was something that you considered in your</p> <p>13 discrimination analysis, in your decision to propose a</p> <p>14 plan that discriminated?</p> <p>15 A. In my decision to propose a plan that provided</p> <p>16 different payout levels for creditors, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And it weighed in favor of it?</p> <p>18 A. It weighed in -- not so much in favor, I'm -- favor of</p> <p>19 what?</p> <p>20 Q. Well, in favor of paying pensioners more than</p> <p>21 financial creditors?</p> <p>22 A. The fact that there are assets in the funds assisted</p> <p>23 us in paying them more than financial creditors, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. What information did you base that -- that</p> <p>25 decision to provide differing levels of recoveries on?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 different scenarios and reduced.</p> <p>3 Q. But what information did you rely upon in deciding how</p> <p>4 to allocate the money that could be paid in terms of</p> <p>5 whether it went to pensioners or whether it went to</p> <p>6 financial creditors?</p> <p>7 A. I think we're discussing the same answer. We would</p> <p>8 look at information regarding the unfunded liability</p> <p>9 of the funds, the amount of anticipated revenue the</p> <p>10 City could take in and could expect to take in, the</p> <p>11 obligations that the City could afford, the potential</p> <p>12 obligations of the City going forward for retiree</p> <p>13 healthcare, for instance, as well as for current</p> <p>14 employee, active employee healthcare obligations, just</p> <p>15 a number of different information that we could</p> <p>16 provide, we could analyze to try to get at a</p> <p>17 determination of what we could pay different classes</p> <p>18 of creditors.</p> <p>19 Q. But that tells you what the total size of the pie is,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. But it also tells us what we think we can pay.</p> <p>22 Q. Right, to creditors?</p> <p>23 A. Right, there's an analysis of the total debt load</p> <p>24 which we published in the June 14th proposal, and then</p> <p>25 there is analysis of the revenue streams that come</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 A. Well, there is a number of information. Generally, we</p> <p>3 would go through the expected debt service of the</p> <p>4 City, what anticipated revenue streams would be going</p> <p>5 forward, what the City would need for reinvestment and</p> <p>6 revitalization, what the funding levels of the pension</p> <p>7 funds were, amongst others, there was a number of</p> <p>8 information and -- and it was a very dynamic and fluid</p> <p>9 process as we examined a number of different potential</p> <p>10 outcomes and scenarios.</p> <p>11 Q. I understand that there is an enormous amount of</p> <p>12 information that implicates what the City has to give</p> <p>13 to creditors at all, okay? And I heard your answer to</p> <p>14 relate to that subject, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Right.</p> <p>16 Q. I'm asking a more specific question, which is with</p> <p>17 respect to your decision to pay classes 10 and 11 more</p> <p>18 than financial creditors, what information did you</p> <p>19 rely on in making that decision? So this is more not</p> <p>20 how much money is there but who will get what money is</p> <p>21 available.</p> <p>22 A. All of the information I just mentioned. I mean,</p> <p>23 there is a number of different factors that go into</p> <p>24 what we can potentially pay financial creditors, and</p> <p>25 we took all that information in on a number of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 into the City that we could use to service those</p> <p>3 obligations, not just financial creditors but</p> <p>4 pensioners, and then there's an analysis of what we</p> <p>5 would need to do to take the revenue stream to address</p> <p>6 the unfunded actuarial liability and other obligations</p> <p>7 that we would have with financial creditors, and we</p> <p>8 would run different scenarios as to how that could be</p> <p>9 done --</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. -- in this environment.</p> <p>12 Q. I'm looking -- I don't think -- we may not be</p> <p>13 communicating well, I'm sure I'm not asking my</p> <p>14 questions correctly, but once you've determined how</p> <p>15 much you have in theory to distribute to creditors</p> <p>16 there's a separate decision that has to be made as to</p> <p>17 which creditors should get what parts of that pie; do</p> <p>18 you agree with that statement?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I think that's fair.</p> <p>20 Q. And I want to focus on the process of deciding which</p> <p>21 creditors get which part of the pie, and I want to</p> <p>22 understand what information you relied upon in</p> <p>23 deciding to give pensioners a larger slice of the pie</p> <p>24 than you gave financial creditors --</p> <p>25 A. Yeah.</p>

Pages 206 to 209

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

13-53846-sw Doc 7122 Filed 08/27/14 Entered 08/27/14 19:29:35 Page 50 of 60

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. -- in the first plan.</p> <p>3 A. Yeah, let's do it this way: There are factors that</p> <p>4 you're considering, and I think what you're trying to</p> <p>5 get at is judgment, which is different than the</p> <p>6 factors that come in to what you have and who you can</p> <p>7 pay. And the judgment decisions about what we could</p> <p>8 pay took into account a number of these other factors</p> <p>9 regarding revenue streams, but ultimately in deciding</p> <p>10 what we could pay pensioners, there were, I would say,</p> <p>11 several different factors which really spurred that</p> <p>12 decision.</p> <p>13 One was the amount of funds that were in</p> <p>14 the various pension funds. Two was the obligation to</p> <p>15 try to take into account the situation of these</p> <p>16 pensioners. Three was that at some point, it became</p> <p>17 apparent that there was going to be additional money</p> <p>18 coming in in the form of the Grand Bargain from</p> <p>19 third-party guarantors who were -- as a condition of</p> <p>20 those grants that they be dedicated solely to pension.</p> <p>21 Three was that at some point, it became</p> <p>22 clear that the pension funds, themselves, were</p> <p>23 performing better over the year and had experienced</p> <p>24 better rate of returns than in prior years, and, in</p> <p>25 fact, the asset values went up. All of those factors</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 have publicly announced agreements, I think that's</p> <p>3 fair.</p> <p>4 Q. You didn't have any publicly announced agreements with</p> <p>5 anyone I don't believe until April 15th, 2014; is that</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A. When -- you may have information regarding -- when you</p> <p>8 say anyone, you mean any creditors?</p> <p>9 Q. I mean any of these retiree representative --</p> <p>10 A. Okay.</p> <p>11 Q. -- bodies that --</p> <p>12 A. Okay.</p> <p>13 Q. -- or that I take to mean retiree associations,</p> <p>14 pension systems official committee.</p> <p>15 A. Okay. And so you're taking out the swaps, for</p> <p>16 instance, you're not including --</p> <p>17 Q. Oh, absolutely.</p> <p>18 A. Okay.</p> <p>19 Q. Yeah, I'm just talking about what the pensioners --</p> <p>20 A. Okay, yes, I think that's fair.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And just to get the record clear, as of -- your</p> <p>22 recollection as you sit here today is that as of</p> <p>23 April 1st, you did not have agreements with any of the</p> <p>24 retiree representative parties, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I don't think we have formally announced</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 went into the decision to decide how much we could pay</p> <p>3 pensioners.</p> <p>4 Q. Any other factors than that?</p> <p>5 A. Probably, but I don't recall them sitting here today.</p> <p>6 Q. And when you say the obligation to take into account</p> <p>7 the pensioner situation, that's referring to the human</p> <p>8 dimension that we talked about earlier, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I think that's fair.</p> <p>10 Q. Now, let's go forward in time from the first plan</p> <p>11 of -- that we've just been talking about, which is</p> <p>12 February 21?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, mm-hmm.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Let's go forward in time to April 1, 2014,</p> <p>15 which is about 40 days later, okay? April Fools' Day.</p> <p>16 A. I wasn't going to say that but --</p> <p>17 Q. You know I picked it. Now, let's -- so put yourself</p> <p>18 back in your state of mind as of April 1, 2014, okay?</p> <p>19 A. Right.</p> <p>20 Q. As of that time, you still didn't have agreement with</p> <p>21 any of the retiree associations or committees or</p> <p>22 retirement systems with respect to the proposed</p> <p>23 pension cuts, correct?</p> <p>24 A. The reason I'm not recalling whether or not that's</p> <p>25 accurate, at some point in the spring -- we did not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 agreements as of April 1st, to the best of my</p> <p>3 recollection.</p> <p>4 Q. Now, on April 1st -- and the plan that was on file at</p> <p>5 that time still called for the 26 percent and 6</p> <p>6 percent cuts that we discussed earlier, correct?</p> <p>7 A. If -- I remember we filed a revised plan, I believe,</p> <p>8 in March, but I'll take you at your -- at your</p> <p>9 representation because it's just not -- I just don't</p> <p>10 remember it in front of me, but I think that's true.</p> <p>11 Q. My recollection is that the revisions to the plan</p> <p>12 changed the cut levels in the event that the plan was</p> <p>13 voted down so they made it more draconian if those</p> <p>14 classes rejected the plan --</p> <p>15 A. Right.</p> <p>16 Q. -- but that the top-level cuts, if the Grand Bargain</p> <p>17 approved, stayed the same?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, I think that's accurate, but the plan will speak</p> <p>19 for itself so --</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. -- I'll be bound by what the plan says.</p> <p>22 Q. That's fine, I'm just trying to -- your best</p> <p>23 recollection as you sit here today is that I have it</p> <p>24 about right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

Pages 210 to 213

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 of recovery in the plan that is currently on file, 3 classes 10 and 11 are being paid more than the COP 4 holders; isn't that correct? 5 A. Yeah, are being paid more than as proposed to the COP 6 holders, yes. 7 Q. Okay. And they're being paid substantially more, 8 correct? 9 A. I think it's a significant difference. 10 Q. Okay. Now, in fact, under the current plan, according 11 to the disclosure statement the GRS and PFRS classes 12 recover approximately 59 cents on the dollar, correct? 13 A. Yeah, I think in the plan, obviously, there's a 14 schedule that shows percentage, but if that's the 15 schedule, yes. 16 Q. I think it's actually technically 60 cents for GRS and 17 59 cents for PFRS? 18 A. Yeah, that's -- 19 Q. That's about correct, right? 20 A. That's about correct, maybe a little bit lower on the 21 PFR -- but that's about correct. 22 Q. Okay, and the COPs recover at most 10 cents on the 23 dollar, correct? 24 A. Yeah, there's a range of potential recovery for the 25 certificates of participation but it's stated at 10</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 in them, which would mean we'd have less ground to 3 make up as opposed to the liability of the 4 certificates which is a -- an ongoing liability, as 5 between the concerns that the obligations, the human 6 dimension, the responsibility the City had to try to 7 keep its covenant with its employees and retirees as 8 opposed to legal arguments that have been made in the 9 papers regarding the COPs that we believe they are 10 void ab initio and that we have no obligation and 11 probably a number of other factors that I'm just not 12 recalling as I sit here today, that resulted in us 13 proposing in the plan that the GRS and PFRS 14 beneficiaries receive a higher recovery than the COPs. 15 Q. Okay. So my question is trying to drive on the 16 factors that you considered in exercising your 17 judgment to discriminate between these two classes. 18 A. Right. 19 Q. Do you understand that? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. And you identified four, the existence of assets held 22 in the trusts -- 23 A. Mm-hmm. 24 Q. -- the human dimension that we've discussed earlier, 25 the City's covenant to pay retirees their pensions --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 percent. 3 Q. That's based, in part, on the fact that there is an 4 invalidity lawsuit against the certificates and the 5 potential to settle that as part of the plan, correct? 6 A. Yes, I think that's fair. 7 Q. The 10 cents that's in the disclosure statement 8 represents the best the COPs can do if they are 9 vindicated in the invalidity lawsuit, meaning that the 10 certificates are found to be valid? 11 A. Well, no, that's why I said I think there's a range. 12 The -- 13 Q. I mean the 10 cents is the best they can do? 14 A. Yeah, I -- okay, 10 cent -- the 10 cents is our 15 estimate of the best they could do. 16 Q. Okay, so with respect to the plan that is on file, and 17 that you're seeking to confirm, with respect to 18 classes 10 and 11 on the one hand and the COPs holder 19 class on the other hand, why did you decide to 20 discriminate in favor of classes 10 and 11 as compared 21 to the COPs holders? And by discriminate, I mean pay 22 them more recovery than you've paid to the COPs holder 23 class? 24 A. Right. As we said earlier this morning, in addition 25 to, you know, the assets that the retirement funds had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 A. Mm-hmm. 3 Q. -- and the invalidity of the COPs? 4 A. Yeah, the legal position of the COPs, but there may 5 be -- there may be other factors that go into that 6 analysis. I'm just trying to give you off the top of 7 my head sitting here today some of the factors that we 8 considered in terms of proposing the plan. 9 Q. Well -- 10 A. There may be -- 11 Q. Oh, sorry. 12 A. There may be factors having to do with negotiated 13 positions, with a number of other issues, so I don't 14 want to give you the impression that the only thing 15 are the factors you're writing down, there may be 16 other considerations we took into account. 17 Q. Well, I guess I'll say understood, but you are the 18 decider, right? 19 A. Yes, I am. 20 Q. Okay, and so -- 21 A. I am the -- the decider has a different connotation to 22 it, so I'm the emergency manager. 23 Q. You're talking what, the "W" connotation? 24 A. Yeah. 25 Q. Oh, okay.</p>

Pages 222 to 225

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

13-53846-sw Doc 7122 Filed 08/27/14 Entered 08/27/14 19:29:35 Page 52 of 60

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 234</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 respect to their mean pensions. 3 A. No, it was also with probable -- it wasn't just 4 pensions, it also -- there was aggregate data 5 regarding healthcare, there's aggregate data regarding 6 an alternative savings fund recoupment. So I know 7 you're focusing principally on pensions, but I looked 8 at a number of data as a composite of what the impact 9 would be to these pensioners from a human dimension. 10 Q. Okay, and evaluating the personal hardship they would 11 suffer? 12 A. Correct. 13 Q. Okay. And that was -- was that one of the most 14 important things that drove you in connection with 15 this decision? It seems like it's moved you. 16 A. Well, I don't know if it's one of the most important, 17 but it -- all of them are important, the amount of 18 money, the Grand Bargain, the -- the grantors have 19 given us \$866 million we didn't have seven months ago 20 so that's pretty important. 21 The human dimension certainly is something 22 that you have to take into account. These are real 23 people with real consequences. So all of it's fairly 24 important to me. 25 Q. Okay. Now, you -- the third thing you talked about</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 236</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 holders, you identified was the City's covenant. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And I took that to mean the fact that the City had a 5 contractual obligation to pay these people? 6 A. Right, and what I'm trying to relay to you is it's not 7 just a fact that the City had a contractual 8 obligation; it is the commitment and reliance on that 9 commitment behind that contractual obligation that 10 various City employees and retirees will come and 11 express to me in very real terms what this means to 12 them. 13 Q. I see. 14 A. And so the covenant is not just a technical document, 15 it is also an expectation, a reliance, a commitment 16 the City has made, and employees and retirees express 17 it to me in very -- sometimes very candid terms. 18 Q. I see. What you're saying is you relied not only the 19 existence of the legal obligation to pay but also 20 testimonies you got from people that they had relied 21 on that? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And isn't it fair to say that this is another element 24 of the human dimension, which is the unfairness of 25 cutting the pensions of people who relied on the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 235</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 was the City's covenant, which I understood you to 3 mean the City's promise that it would pay these people 4 their pensions? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. And I take it from that the information you would have 7 relied upon was just the contract saying that folks 8 were entitled to these pensions? 9 A. No, you know, we -- I also had access -- you know, I 10 talked with some City employees, for instance, who 11 currently work for the City, Gary Brown, who is a 12 retired Detroit police officer but is on a personal 13 service contract here in the City now, PSC, and I 14 talked to him about the historical commitments that 15 the City has made, he's a lifetime resident, been here 16 a long time. Chief Craig, who was born here, for 17 instance, and his parents have been in the City, I 18 talked to him. I talked to individuals. 19 So it's not just an analysis of, say, raw 20 data. I mean, I have communications with people on 21 staff here in the City who will ask me if they can 22 come in and talk to me, and I'll listen to them. 23 Q. I guess what I meant here is one of the factors you 24 identified as -- as informing your judgment with 25 respect to what to pay classes 10 and 11 versus COPs</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 237</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2 2 City's covenant in making decisions about how to 3 allocate their work time? 4 A. You could say that. 5 Q. And then the last issue that you identified was the 6 invalidity of the COPs; do you remember that? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. And that was something that you factored into your 9 decision in terms of paying the COPs less than classes 10 10 and 11, correct? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And I take it you relied upon legal analysis from your 13 counsel about the potential invalidity of the COPs, 14 correct? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And I know that there had been a lawsuit filed prior 17 to the time of the current plan being filed, but I 18 assume that if I asked you questions about what your 19 attorneys had advised you with respect to the 20 invalidity of the COPs you'll invoke the 21 attorney-client privilege and decline to answer? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Okay, so I hope we can stipulate that if I ask a bunch 24 of questions about how the COPs analysis factored into 25 the decision that the attorney-client privilege will</p>

Pages 234 to 237

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 238</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 be invoked?</p> <p>3 MR. SHUMAKER: Assuming your question gets</p> <p>4 to communications between counsel and Mr. Orr, yes.</p> <p>5 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>6 Q. Well, I mean, did you -- did you -- in assessing the</p> <p>7 invalidity of the COPs as a factor justifying the</p> <p>8 level of discrimination, did you consider anything</p> <p>9 other than legal advice around the invalidity of the</p> <p>10 COPs? It seems like a legal question.</p> <p>11 A. It's a legal question, but in an effort to be</p> <p>12 forthcoming and fair to you, I'd have to say yes, and</p> <p>13 I'll try to tell you, for instance, without discussing</p> <p>14 the -- and going afield of many discussions, legal</p> <p>15 opinions, analyses, meetings, written opinions, that I</p> <p>16 received from counsel.</p> <p>17 So for instance, in looking at the COPs, in</p> <p>18 addition to those things, you know, I examined news</p> <p>19 reports about that transaction, I think I've even</p> <p>20 examined those -- some of those before I got here.</p> <p>21 Reports, for instance, by the auditor general that it</p> <p>22 questioned the propriety and validity of the COPs</p> <p>23 reports at that time when -- I think it was Auditor</p> <p>24 General Hart (ph.) back in 2005, City Council</p> <p>25 statements that were made. Statements made by the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 240</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 one reason to pay the COPs on their best day 10 cents?</p> <p>3 A. Yeah, I don't know -- I don't want to give the</p> <p>4 impression that it was that binary, you know, a number</p> <p>5 of issues, as I said before, went into what we could</p> <p>6 afford to pay--</p> <p>7 Q. Yes.</p> <p>8 A. -- the validity of the claim, which is pretty typical</p> <p>9 in bankruptcies, all that stuff, but I think that's a</p> <p>10 fair statement.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay, I'm talking when you were deciding how to divide</p> <p>12 the pie, the COPs best day recovery was impacted by</p> <p>13 this factor of the potential invalidity of the COPs?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Now, with respect to the information in these four</p> <p>16 areas that we've just talked about, the information</p> <p>17 that relates to each of the four factors you</p> <p>18 identified --</p> <p>19 A. Mm-hmm.</p> <p>20 Q. -- was there a material change in this body of</p> <p>21 information between April 1 and April 15 of 2014?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know, you say material change, what are you --</p> <p>23 what do you mean?</p> <p>24 Q. Is there anything that sticks out to you with respect</p> <p>25 to any of your four factors and the information</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 239</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 City treasurer back then that it was invalid and</p> <p>3 inappropriate to enter into the COPs and that it would</p> <p>4 make the City bankrupt and that the City should have</p> <p>5 declared bankruptcy in 2005.</p> <p>6 So there's other data that I looked at to</p> <p>7 inform myself, just not the legal analyses about</p> <p>8 position of the COPs, and some of that data was</p> <p>9 contemporaneous with when they were initially entered</p> <p>10 into and some of that was subsequent to that.</p> <p>11 Q. And you identified a number of individuals or reports</p> <p>12 that you had read; I didn't hear any lawyers in any of</p> <p>13 those things. Were there?</p> <p>14 A. None of my lawyers were in those things, so there</p> <p>15 was -- there's, you know, document -- documentary</p> <p>16 evidence that is short of the legal opinions I got</p> <p>17 from my counsel.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay, so but to tie it up, was the principal</p> <p>19 information that you relied upon legal advice conveyed</p> <p>20 to you by your lawyers about the invalidity of the</p> <p>21 COPs?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And I -- just so I understand the way the judge -- the</p> <p>24 factor plays through your judgment, you looked at the</p> <p>25 potential invalidity of the COPs and viewed that as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 241</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 associated with each that changed materially between</p> <p>3 April 1 and April 15?</p> <p>4 A. To be frank with you, I can't -- I can't recall if</p> <p>5 there was, but I don't -- nothing jumps out at me.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Now, in structuring the plan, did you take</p> <p>7 advice from Miller Buckfire?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And in deciding what levels of discrimination between</p> <p>10 creditors was appropriate, did you also take advice</p> <p>11 from Miller Buckfire?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And did you specifically take advice from Ken</p> <p>14 Buckfire?</p> <p>15 A. I -- I would have regular restrictions (sic) with Ken</p> <p>16 and other members of his team, so I think it's fair to</p> <p>17 say yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Did Mr. Buckfire recommend to you that when it came to</p> <p>19 evaluating the recovery of the retirees that the City</p> <p>20 should consider the pension recoveries in combination</p> <p>21 with the OPEB recoveries in making a determination as</p> <p>22 to what the level of discrimination was?</p> <p>23 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>24 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>25 Q. Do you understand my question?</p>

Pages 238 to 241

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 274</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 boy.</p> <p>3 MR. HACKNEY: I am, born and raised, but</p> <p>4 I've actually lived in Chicago now --</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Are you coming back? Are you</p> <p>6 coming back?</p> <p>7 MR. HACKNEY: No, no, I'm a Chicagoan.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>9 MR. HACKNEY: You lost me.</p> <p>10 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>11 Q. Let me see if I can tie it up this way. You did not</p> <p>12 attempt to undertake a systematic analysis of what all</p> <p>13 the creditors thought that they were going to get when</p> <p>14 they made their respective investment decisions to</p> <p>15 decide who should get what?</p> <p>16 A. I did not poll all of the creditors regarding what</p> <p>17 they thought they were going to get.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay, and you didn't factor that into your conclusion,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. No. Not at least that I can say -- I can't say what</p> <p>21 discussions were made in mediation, but I -- publicly</p> <p>22 the answer would be no.</p> <p>23 Q. I am talking about, you know, your state of mind,</p> <p>24 though. I'm saying that you didn't go and pick</p> <p>25 winners and losers based on what people's expectations</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 276</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 know, based upon your expectation of being paid, you</p> <p>3 know, this is what we can pay. We generally drove the</p> <p>4 determinations based upon the revenue stream and the</p> <p>5 strengths and weaknesses and negotiations with any</p> <p>6 particular creditor group?</p> <p>7 Q. And I take it you did not, for example, go back and</p> <p>8 review the due diligence materials that were provided</p> <p>9 to the COPs creditors in the 2005 and 2006</p> <p>10 transactions, correct?</p> <p>11 A. I didn't do it personally but some of my advisors did.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. But, I mean, you don't know what was in those</p> <p>13 due diligence materials?</p> <p>14 A. No, some of those materials, I -- I did see some of</p> <p>15 those materials and I saw some of the legal opinions</p> <p>16 that were provided back then.</p> <p>17 Q. In fact, the legal opinions that were provided back</p> <p>18 then told COPs holders that the COPs were legal,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. Some of them did, there was one law firm in the City</p> <p>21 that refused to do the transaction because they opined</p> <p>22 or at least informed people that they thought it was</p> <p>23 illegal.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you recall what the COPs holders were told</p> <p>25 about the nature of the remedy that would exist if the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 275</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 were when they invested?</p> <p>3 A. No, I don't view it as picking winners and losers</p> <p>4 because I don't think anybody here has said to me that</p> <p>5 they think of themselves as winners.</p> <p>6 We tried to do an analysis of what we could</p> <p>7 afford to pay based upon the factors we discussed</p> <p>8 before with an understanding that \$866 million was</p> <p>9 coming in as a gift from grantors with specific</p> <p>10 condition that that money would flow to pensioners as</p> <p>11 opposed to any other creditor class and that we would</p> <p>12 accept that gift with that condition when those</p> <p>13 discussions were made.</p> <p>14 Q. Understood, I'm just trying to say -- picking winners</p> <p>15 and losers was a euphemism, I didn't mean to be</p> <p>16 casual. You didn't set respective recovery levels</p> <p>17 based on the fact that you thought some creditors</p> <p>18 should be paid less based on their expectations when</p> <p>19 they invested as opposed to others?</p> <p>20 A. No, that really wasn't a factor. I mean, did I</p> <p>21 personally believe that there may have been creditors</p> <p>22 who were more capable of doing underwriting about the</p> <p>23 City's debt condition has been -- as had been reported</p> <p>24 in various publications that I'd read, yes, I</p> <p>25 understood that but I didn't sit down and say, you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 277</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 City failed to pay the service corps?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know who the COPs holders were at the time of</p> <p>5 the COPs offering?</p> <p>6 A. There was a list of who they were, but sitting here</p> <p>7 off the top of my head, no.</p> <p>8 MR. HACKNEY: Let's mark this as our next</p> <p>9 exhibit.</p> <p>10 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:</p> <p>11 DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 21</p> <p>12 11:29 a.m.</p> <p>13 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>14 Q. Mr. Orr, is this the offering memorandum that was put</p> <p>15 out in connection with the 2005 COPs?</p> <p>16 A. Without sitting here and reading through it, to the</p> <p>17 best of my knowledge, this appears like a document</p> <p>18 I've seen before as the offering document.</p> <p>19 Q. And have you read this document before?</p> <p>20 A. I have not read the document in total; I have read</p> <p>21 pieces of it.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. You didn't just sit down and one day say, I</p> <p>23 want to read the offering memorandum?</p> <p>24 A. I did not read through the whole document.</p> <p>25 Q. Now, if you look at page 8, I want to read you a</p>

Pages 274 to 277

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 334</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I think Mr. Buckfire is an expert in that area.</p> <p>3 Q. And in this subject matter we're discussing of likely</p> <p>4 rates of return, likely levels of risk, would you tend</p> <p>5 to defer to him in terms of his view?</p> <p>6 A. I would certainly solicit his view. His view is very</p> <p>7 informed and very capable, but having been in the City</p> <p>8 now for over a year, I certainly would want to be</p> <p>9 informed but ultimately it's -- I'd have to make a</p> <p>10 call of keeping my own counsel.</p> <p>11 Q. Would you agree that lenders are tripping over</p> <p>12 themselves to lend the City money?</p> <p>13 MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>14 A. I think we've had -- you know, every time I use a</p> <p>15 iteration (sic) or metaphor, you quote it back to me,</p> <p>16 so I'm going to say that I think we've had a healthy</p> <p>17 amount of interest, and some people might well</p> <p>18 characterize that as tripping over themselves.</p> <p>19 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>20 Q. And there's a great deal of enthusiasm that you're</p> <p>21 finding from both investors and lenders, correct?</p> <p>22 A. That appears to be the case.</p> <p>23 Q. And that's based on the substantial deleveraging that</p> <p>24 the City's achieving through this plan, correct?</p> <p>25 A. I think that --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 336</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. Mr. Orr, welcome back from lunch.</p> <p>3 A. Thank you, Mr. Hackney.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So Mr. Orr, you're aware that certain</p> <p>5 charitable foundations have agreed to contributed</p> <p>6 money to the City's pension obligations in exchange</p> <p>7 for the City conveying its art collection into a</p> <p>8 public trust; is that correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And I take it if I ask you questions about your</p> <p>11 communications with the charitable foundations in</p> <p>12 connection with their agreement to contribute this</p> <p>13 money, you will refuse to answer on the grounds of the</p> <p>14 mediation order's confidentiality provisions; is that</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, generally for most of them, I think that's</p> <p>17 correct.</p> <p>18 Q. And just for the record, you didn't have any such</p> <p>19 conversations prior to the entry of the mediation</p> <p>20 order which was at some point in September of 2013?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. Well, let me think. I think I had one meeting with</p> <p>24 Darren Walker at Ford Foundation, but it was not about</p> <p>25 a contribution, it was just a meet and greet.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 335</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. In part?</p> <p>3 A. I think that is fair.</p> <p>4 Q. You know, Mr. Orr, I've reached a good stopping point,</p> <p>5 I think.</p> <p>6 MR. SHUMAKER: Sure.</p> <p>7 MR. HACKNEY: There's a lot of people in</p> <p>8 the room, but I kind of defer to you.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No, I'm good, but if you guys</p> <p>10 think that makes sense, we have a thing that we need</p> <p>11 to do.</p> <p>12 MR. HACKNEY: What time?</p> <p>13 MR. HERTZBERG: At 1:15 for 5 minutes.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. HACKNEY: That will be perfect then,</p> <p>16 we'll take an hour for lunch, and then I'll see you at</p> <p>17 1:30.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>19 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is now 12:31</p> <p>20 p.m., we are now off the record.</p> <p>21 (Recess taken at 12:31 p.m.)</p> <p>22 (Back on the record at 1:36 p.m.)</p> <p>23 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is 1:36 p.m.,</p> <p>24 we are back on the record.</p> <p>25 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 337</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. Okay?</p> <p>4 Q. Yeah, I saw that in the documents, and there were some</p> <p>5 issues about the Ford Foundation and the building that</p> <p>6 they owned or something that --</p> <p>7 A. I didn't even get into all that.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. It was just hi, how are you, they were helping us with</p> <p>10 some grants, helping us stand up a grants</p> <p>11 administrator.</p> <p>12 Q. So I guess I want to make a record of something I</p> <p>13 understand from the City's position but it is the</p> <p>14 City's position that communications with the</p> <p>15 foundation are either part of or incidental to the</p> <p>16 mediation, correct?</p> <p>17 MR. SHUMAKER: I believe that's correct.</p> <p>18 Again, I think you could fish outside the contours of</p> <p>19 those mediation talks but my understanding is that all</p> <p>20 those talks were within the context of mediation.</p> <p>21 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>22 Q. Yeah, I mean, I don't want to ask a hundred questions</p> <p>23 today to establish what I think is relatively well</p> <p>24 established, which is that you're not, generally</p> <p>25 speaking, going to discuss your conversations with the</p>

Pages 334 to 337

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

Page 338	Page 340
<p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 foundations, correct?</p> <p>3 A. That is correct. You know, I may -- let me say this</p> <p>4 generally. I may have had meetings with foundation</p> <p>5 principals outside of the confines of the mediation,</p> <p>6 just hail-fellow-well-met, saw them at an event, how</p> <p>7 are you. There were no substantive conversations</p> <p>8 about the contribution that did not occur outside of</p> <p>9 the mediation order.</p> <p>10 Q. And that's fine, because the only ones that I really</p> <p>11 want to ask you about are ones that relate to the</p> <p>12 Grand Bargain?</p> <p>13 A. Right, right.</p> <p>14 Q. And those would fall under the gambit of the</p> <p>15 mediation?</p> <p>16 A. Those would fall under the gambit of mediation.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, if I asked you your state of mind based on what</p> <p>18 you understood the foundations to be willing to do or</p> <p>19 what you thought they would be willing to do, you</p> <p>20 would also invoke the mediation order to the extent</p> <p>21 his state of mind was created by communications of the</p> <p>22 foundation, correct?</p> <p>23 MR. SHUMAKER: I think that's right because</p> <p>24 I don't see how he could give you his impressions or</p> <p>25 his understanding without going into what was going on</p>	<p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 A. I think I have to.</p> <p>3 Q. If I ask you did the foundations ever offer to</p> <p>4 contribute money without insisting on transfer of the</p> <p>5 art institute, you'll decline to answer that question,</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A. I think I have to.</p> <p>8 Q. And if I ask you hey, who is it that imposed the</p> <p>9 condition on the Grand Bargain that the art institute</p> <p>10 would be transferred, was it you, or was it them, or</p> <p>11 was it Judge Rosen, you'll decline to answer those</p> <p>12 questions, correct?</p> <p>13 A. I believe so.</p> <p>14 Q. Mr. Orr, has the Grand Bargain -- which you know what</p> <p>15 I'm talking about, right?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, the money we talked about before, the 366 million</p> <p>17 from the foundations, a \$350 million value settlement</p> <p>18 from the State, and \$100 million from the DIA</p> <p>19 benefactors as funneled through the Founders' Society.</p> <p>20 Q. Correct, in exchange for the art -- in connection with</p> <p>21 the art being -- the DIA being conveyed into a public</p> <p>22 trust, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Contributions targeted towards the two pension funds</p> <p>24 with the condition that not one piece of art be sold</p> <p>25 or de-assessed as a result of this process.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 339</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 in the mediation.</p> <p>3 MR. HACKNEY: Right, because he lacks</p> <p>4 foundation to speak to what the foundations thought.</p> <p>5 If I asked him what he understood them to have</p> <p>6 thought, you'll take the position that it would be</p> <p>7 based on what they told him?</p> <p>8 MR. SHUMAKER: Correct, it all would have</p> <p>9 been derived from the mediation discussions.</p> <p>10 MR. HACKNEY: Okay, and so I'll just note</p> <p>11 for the record, Mr. Shumaker, that this is the</p> <p>12 position that Ms. Kofsky (ph.), a cop, took in a prior</p> <p>13 deposition, and I understand the basis for it. I will</p> <p>14 let you know that I don't necessarily agree with it</p> <p>15 based on comments that Judge Rhodes made about how</p> <p>16 state of mind might work in the mediation context, but</p> <p>17 it doesn't matter because I feel like we're not going</p> <p>18 to work that out today anyway.</p> <p>19 MR. SHUMAKER: Understood.</p> <p>20 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>21 Q. And I just want to understand you all's position on</p> <p>22 it. So just a couple big ones, if I ask you did you</p> <p>23 ever ask the foundations to contribute money with no</p> <p>24 strings attached you'll decline to ask answer that</p> <p>25 question, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 341</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. And the purpose of the transfer to a public trust is</p> <p>3 to ensure that the art is never sold to satisfy the</p> <p>4 claims of the City's creditors, correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, now and forever, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Not only current creditors but future ones, as well?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. So has the Grand Bargain, Mr. Orr, helped the COPs</p> <p>9 holders to achieve a higher recovery?</p> <p>10 A. I don't think so.</p> <p>11 Q. Mr. Orr, what are the principal terms of the LTGO</p> <p>12 settlement?</p> <p>13 A. The LTGO settlement centers around a dedicated millage</p> <p>14 that's to extend for the next approximately 13 years,</p> <p>15 and the terms of a settlement that roughly 26</p> <p>16 percent -- oh, the LTGO, I'm sorry --</p> <p>17 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>18 A. Okay, I'm sorry, I'm going -- I thought you were just</p> <p>19 talking about -- I'm doing it temporally --</p> <p>20 Q. That's okay.</p> <p>21 A. I'm sorry.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm hopping around.</p> <p>23 A. Okay.</p> <p>24 Q. Let's start over.</p> <p>25 A. Let's start over.</p>

Pages 338 to 341

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

13-53846-sw Doc 7122 Filed 08/27/14 Entered 08/27/14 19:29:35 Page 57 of 60

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 342</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. So let's set the stage. The LTGO settlement has been 3 announced in the press, and there's some information 4 that's kind of available about it, but I actually 5 literally don't know --</p> <p>6 A. Right.</p> <p>7 Q. -- what the terms are, and there's been some 8 suggestion that it's the continued subject of 9 negotiations, so I want to give you a fair setup.</p> <p>10 A. Yeah, that's -- that's why I was -- I can talk about 11 LTGO...</p> <p>12 MR. SHUMAKER: You can discuss what's made 13 public.</p> <p>14 A. Okay. The mediators issued a statement on the LTGOs 15 we did not, my office did not, recognizing that there 16 was a settlement which, in part, dealt with a class of 17 creditors, I think 170-some-odd-million dollars of 18 claims, which would get an allowed claim in a certain 19 amount. The -- I know from e-mails that I received as 20 late as last night that some of the final details are 21 still under discussion so I'm a little -- that was 22 done in the mediation, so I don't want to run afoul of 23 the mediation order as far as if you have a press 24 release, I'll be happy to discuss about what's in the 25 release but I don't know if I can discuss any more</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 344</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 but I asked like Heather for this, Ms. Lennox, and she 3 actually referred me to this information.</p> <p>4 A. Right.</p> <p>5 Q. But then I wasn't able to confirm that that was the 6 whole deal and so that's why you have this big 7 involved --</p> <p>8 A. Right.</p> <p>9 Q. -- lead-in, okay? So let's just start with, is it 10 your understanding that -- let's do it this way. Is 11 it your understanding that at least part of the deal 12 that is part of the agreement in principal that is 13 public is that they will get approximately 34 cents on 14 their unsecured claim?</p> <p>15 A. Yeah. Without having any intent to directly or 16 indirectly violate the mediation order, I do not think 17 it is unfair based upon published reports, but I do 18 not recall that the mediation statement included the 19 actual amount.</p> <p>20 Q. It didn't.</p> <p>21 A. Yeah, so I don't -- I don't want to necessarily go 22 beyond what was included in that statement, I think 23 the statement was generally there was a settlement of 24 a certain amount and recognition of a claim. I'll 25 stick with that. There is no reason for me to believe</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 343</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 than that.</p> <p>3 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>4 Q. It's frankly been kind of confused on this, but I'll 5 tell you what I know. First, it's my understanding 6 that you do not have a final agreement with the LTGO; 7 is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. I think that is correct.</p> <p>9 Q. What you have is what is loosely described as an 10 agreement in principal on some but not all of the 11 terms, correct?</p> <p>12 A. I think that's fair.</p> <p>13 Q. Now, the -- but the one thing I'm able to see, I'll 14 tell you, in the expert reports is that Mr. Buckfire 15 says that the \$164 million of the unsecured portion of 16 LTGO is getting \$55 million in value of some form, 17 okay? I'll represent to you you can see that in the 18 exhibit. I'll also represent to you that somehow in 19 Mr. Malhotra's work there is some implication that 20 that is paid in 2015 under the forecasts, okay? I'm 21 less sure on that one, okay?</p> <p>22 A. Right.</p> <p>23 Q. What I will tell you is that 55 million on 164 million 24 of unsecured LTGO works out to a 34-cent recovery on 25 that, okay? So -- and I'm -- this is going on and on,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 345</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 that mathematically that that 55 percent of roughly 3 100 --</p> <p>4 Q. No, 34 percent.</p> <p>5 A. No, 55 million of 170-some-odd million is equally 6 equivalent to 34 percent.</p> <p>7 Q. But like as you -- I mean, I'm trying to tell you that 8 it's not just, you know, me -- it's like the debtor's 9 counsel told me to look at these things to get at 10 least some of the terms.</p> <p>11 A. And like I said, I have no reason to dispute what you 12 were told or what they did; I just don't want to do 13 it, okay?</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. So I'm -- I'm trying to stay within -- I have been 16 admonished before about possible breaches of the 17 mediation privilege by -- by several judges now and I 18 don't want to run afoul of that in any way.</p> <p>19 Q. So is it fair to say, Mr. Orr, that I think you're 20 declining to discuss the terms of the LTGO settlement 21 based on caution about not knowing what is and what is 22 not public?</p> <p>23 A. I think that's fair.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. I guess what I will say then is I'm going to 25 reserve my questioning on this, this is also a</p>

Pages 342 to 345

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 346</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 subject -- it was one of the drivers of our motion to</p> <p>3 continue, but in fairness like I really may need to</p> <p>4 come back and re-depose you on this when it's been</p> <p>5 public for at least some period of time because it was</p> <p>6 in flux.</p> <p>7 A. Let me say this, like I said, whatever's public I have</p> <p>8 no reason to believe whatever's been made public is</p> <p>9 inaccurate, but I do know that they're continuing</p> <p>10 discussions regarding details of the settlement, so I</p> <p>11 just want to be very careful.</p> <p>12 Q. And you're also -- fair to say you're unwilling to say</p> <p>13 that the 55 million I alluded to represents the full</p> <p>14 amount of what they're getting, correct?</p> <p>15 A. I have no reason to believe that's not -- there is</p> <p>16 anything in addition to what you may have heard</p> <p>17 economically.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. But are they only getting 55 million or not?</p> <p>19 A. I have no reason to believe there's anything more than</p> <p>20 that.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Well --</p> <p>22 A. Based upon published reports.</p> <p>23 Q. What is the basis for paying the LTGO 34 cents and</p> <p>24 paying COPs holders 10 cents?</p> <p>25 A. Now, I do think we are getting into the mediation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 348</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>3 Q. Okay, you do agree that the City has classified the</p> <p>4 LTGO creditors as general unsecured?</p> <p>5 A. I believe that's our last classification, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay, and that's the same classification as the COPs</p> <p>7 holders?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And you also agree that the LTGO bondholders are</p> <p>10 financial creditors like the COPs holders?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I believe there's financial creditors as opposed</p> <p>12 to pensioners, for instance, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Right, and in fact, many of them have monoline</p> <p>14 insurers standing behind the bond, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. So you would agree there are a lot of similarities</p> <p>17 between the COP holder and the LTGO correct?</p> <p>18 A. There are a lot of perhaps superficial similarities</p> <p>19 but I think the allegations that have been made</p> <p>20 against the COP holders in the litigation raise other</p> <p>21 dissimilarities between them.</p> <p>22 Q. And you're talking about the invalidity suit?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay, and you understand that the way the plan works</p> <p>25 is that the -- a reserve is set up for the COP holders</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 347</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 order.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay, so you're -- you'll decline to answer questions</p> <p>4 about your basis for discriminating between those two</p> <p>5 classes?</p> <p>6 A. I think I have to.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. SHUMAKER: Well, you don't have to --</p> <p>9 you don't have to reveal the terms of the settlement.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Right.</p> <p>11 MR. SHUMAKER: But I think you could talk</p> <p>12 in abstract, in the abstract about comparing the LTGO</p> <p>13 settlement with the COPs holders, which I think is</p> <p>14 what Mr. Hackney is getting at.</p> <p>15 A. Well, let's do this, see if I can talk about it</p> <p>16 generally and I'll try to just step it as we go</p> <p>17 through it to see. I mean, I think it's fair to say</p> <p>18 that that is a result of a negotiated solution in the</p> <p>19 mediation process. I think it's fair to say there was</p> <p>20 some give and take between the parties as to what</p> <p>21 potential claim was. I think it's been reported that</p> <p>22 there was an argument made that that particular class</p> <p>23 of creditors had a different status than just general</p> <p>24 unsecured, and that that status should have some level</p> <p>25 of recognition. I think that's about all I can say.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 349</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 that represents what their total recovery could be?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And that's what their total recovery could be if they</p> <p>5 prevail in the invalidity suit, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, a reserve over a period of time as opposed to a</p> <p>7 hundred-and-X-million dollars of cash, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Yeah. Well, it's actually a bunch of B notes that go</p> <p>9 into the reserve.</p> <p>10 A. That's what I said time, time wise, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay, yeah. Now, are you aware of any other basis to</p> <p>12 distinguish the LTGO from the COPs other than the</p> <p>13 potential invalidity of the COPs and this argument</p> <p>14 that the LTGO have made that they are not an unsecured</p> <p>15 creditor?</p> <p>16 A. Am I aware?</p> <p>17 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Am I aware?</p> <p>19 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>20 Q. Or do you have any other basis for discriminating</p> <p>21 other than those two things?</p> <p>22 MR. SHUMAKER: I think you can answer that.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>25 Q. What is it?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 350</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 A. I think that's caught up in the mediation.</p> <p>3 Q. I'm not sure how that could be.</p> <p>4 A. Well, as I think I've said, there were negotiations,</p> <p>5 there were positions taken. The awareness of what</p> <p>6 those other bases could be came about typically as a</p> <p>7 result of the mediation and reports provided to me out</p> <p>8 of the mediation so I want to be careful about talking</p> <p>9 about them, because that, I think is covered by the</p> <p>10 mediation order.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay, so the two grounds that I identified, invalidity</p> <p>12 and the arguable not unsecuredness of the LTGO are the</p> <p>13 only two that you can publicly discuss?</p> <p>14 A. I believe so.</p> <p>15 Q. You would agree that the LTGO were not granted a lien</p> <p>16 in any City property, correct?</p> <p>17 A. I would agree that I have seen no documents</p> <p>18 memorializing a lien.</p> <p>19 Q. The difference between -- the difference that they</p> <p>20 allege is relevant is that they are to be considered</p> <p>21 quote/unquote a first budget item; isn't that correct?</p> <p>22 A. Here again, I think now we're starting to bump up</p> <p>23 against the mediation.</p> <p>24 Q. So you're not able to answer that question either?</p> <p>25 A. If -- I'd be happy to validate any public statements</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 352</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 independent knowledge once it comes as a result of the</p> <p>3 mediation.</p> <p>4 Q. Understood, and you also can't say as to whether or</p> <p>5 not it's been a factor in your decision?</p> <p>6 A. I -- I don't think I can other than what we've talked</p> <p>7 about.</p> <p>8 Q. Mr. Orr, how did the City arrive at the calculation of</p> <p>9 the size of the OPEB claim that is contained in the</p> <p>10 current plan?</p> <p>11 A. As contained in the current plan? Well, we did --</p> <p>12 well, the City and our advisors in conjunction with</p> <p>13 the advisors of the -- of the funds did an analysis of</p> <p>14 the potential liability for retiree healthcare based</p> <p>15 upon a number of factors including actuarial rates,</p> <p>16 longevity, objective factors such as anticipated rates</p> <p>17 of healthcare spend as published by Michigan State</p> <p>18 Institutions and Federal Government institutions and</p> <p>19 healthcare providers, number of objective criteria as</p> <p>20 calculated with the number of retirees that we have</p> <p>21 and anticipate will have in the future.</p> <p>22 Q. And ultimately the ultimate number was the product</p> <p>23 negotiation between the City and the retiree</p> <p>24 representative parties, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 351</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 that you have, but I don't think I should be the one</p> <p>3 speaking to that.</p> <p>4 Q. It's the subject of a declaratory complaint and like a</p> <p>5 pretty extensive motion to dismiss argument?</p> <p>6 A. Yeah, but I haven't necessarily been involved in the</p> <p>7 legal aspects of that argument. Most of my</p> <p>8 information comes as a result of communications that</p> <p>9 occur in the mediation.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. All right, so you have not followed the give</p> <p>11 and take in the legal issue litigation?</p> <p>12 A. As you might imagine I have not been keeping up with</p> <p>13 the over, as I understand it, almost 8,000 documents</p> <p>14 filed in the bankruptcy, but I have no -- let me ask</p> <p>15 answer it this way. I have no reason to dispute the</p> <p>16 allegations that are contained in the filings.</p> <p>17 Q. By whom?</p> <p>18 A. By any party, whatever their allegations are, they</p> <p>19 are.</p> <p>20 Q. Other than the reasons that you've put in your own</p> <p>21 filings?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, whatever -- whatever's a public record, I have no</p> <p>23 reason -- in the bankruptcy case, there's no reason</p> <p>24 for me to dispute that parties have taken those</p> <p>25 positions, I just can't speak to it of my own</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 353</p> <p>1 KEVYN ORR, VOLUME 2</p> <p>2 Q. Now, you know that in connection with the City's</p> <p>3 bankruptcy petition that it stated that it had \$5.7</p> <p>4 billion in OPEB; do you remember that number?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>6 Q. And do you agree that the \$5.7 billion number includes</p> <p>7 the present value of anticipated OPEB not only for</p> <p>8 retirees but also for active employees, right?</p> <p>9 A. Active employees who will retire.</p> <p>10 Q. Right, it's sort of like it was the analog of the</p> <p>11 pension UAAL --</p> <p>12 A. Right.</p> <p>13 Q. -- which is it looked not just at retirees but it also</p> <p>14 looked at active employees, what their costs will be</p> <p>15 when they retire?</p> <p>16 A. And yes --</p> <p>17 MR. ALBERTS: Objection to form.</p> <p>18 A. In the out-years, so for instance, someone who is an</p> <p>19 active employee today but will retire in 2015 will</p> <p>20 become a retiree in the out-years, yes.</p> <p>21 BY MR. HACKNEY:</p> <p>22 Q. And that OPEB number was in the 5.7 billion?</p> <p>23 A. I believe so.</p> <p>24 Q. Does the City believe that its retirees have a vested</p> <p>25 right to healthcare benefits?</p>

Pages 350 to 353

Elisa Dreier Reporting Corp. (212) 557-5558
950 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022